Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 25X1C10b

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

FOR BACKGROUND USE ONLY

21 August 1972

SOVIET REPRESSION:
A BREACH OF INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

The most remarkable elements in the so-called "dissent" movement in the Soviet Union are its openness and its strict adherence to legality. The movement is dedicated merely to pursuading the Soviet leadership to permit the people of the Soviet Union the rights which their constitution provides for them.

It is the extra-judicial method of coercion which the Soviet leadership has been using with increasing frequency to silence the dissident movement that has increasingly alarmed Western public opinion. Even more alarming is the arbitrary way in which the Soviet leaders persistently breach international treaties and covenants which, as signatories, they have committed themselves to observe.

As a result of formal international agreements signed since the founding of the United Nations, human rights have taken on a legal significance that far overrides traditional concepts under which treatment of a country's nationals was a matter of sovereign discretion. To the extent that human rights and fundamental freedoms have become a legal obligation, they are no longer a matter which is strictly within the domestic jurisdiction of individual countries.

First, the United Nations Charter commits member states to promoting "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." Then by the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and two international covenants adopted in 1968 -- one on civil and political rights and the other on economic, social, and cultural rights -- signatories "undertake to guarantee that the rights enunciated. . .will be exercised without discrimination of any kind as to race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin. . . ."

Among the "rights enunciated" in the 1968 covenant on civil and political rights are: freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention, the right to court hearings by a "competent, independent and impartial tribunal," freedom of movement and choice of residence at home or abroad, protection from "arbitrary. . .interference with. . .privacy. . .home or correspondence. . .unlawful attacks on. . .honor and reputation," freedom of assembly, and the right to "seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers. . .through any media." All, ironically, are similar to rights provided by the Soviet constitution and all are rights denied the Soviet people by their leaders.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Most of the rest of the world finds it increasingly hard to side with the Soviet Union on a wide range of issues involving human rights and Soviet authorities may find it increasingly difficult to ignore adverse Western opinion. Within the Soviet Union, the situation is eerily reminiscent of the tensions that existed a hundred years ago. The basic conflict then, as now, was between an entrenched bureaucracy preoccupied with maintaining the status quo and an intelligentsia intent on pressuring the leadership for more civil rights and liberties. The biggest contrast between the nineteenth and twentieth century situations, however, should really give the Soviet leadership pause: thanks to the highest ever level of education in the USSR, millions of people can read and therefore are prone to think for themselves.

In the paragraphs that follow are reviewed the most recent breaches of international conventions by Soviet authorities in their campaign to still voices of dissent throughout the land:

The Buildup of Repression

In late July a protest letter signed by 52 Russians, including the world renowned nuclear physicist Andrey Sakharov, called the arrest of civil rights leader Pyotr Yakir another step back to Stalinist methods. Then on 1 August Dr. Sakharov appealed, in an open letter to Soviet authorities, on behalf of art critic Viktor Fainburg and engineer Vladimir Borisov "who are dying" in a mental hospital in Leningrad where they have been undergoing forced treatment for more than three years despite a two-year old ruling by the Moscow Serbsky Institute that they no longer needed psychiatric treatment.

These were brave, bold moves considering the warnings that the KGB had just given to Valeri Chalidze, cofounder with Dr. Sakharov of the unofficial Soviet Committee for Human Rights. Twice on 5 and 7 July Chalidze was called before a senior KGB official, the assistant director of the National Department of Investigation, to be told that his committee was guilty of "well-masked anti-Soviet" activity and to be threatened with "repression" --- which means arrest.

Just before President Nixon visited Moscow last spring, Dr. Sakharov had expressed the hope that international detente would "encourage in our country the application of basic freedoms such as freedom of expression, freedom to emigrate, freedom of movement within the country, artistic and social freedom, and religious freedom." Just the opposite seems to be happening. The arrest on 21 June of Pyotr Yakir signaled an even harsher crackdown by the KGB in its anti-dissident campaign which began gathering momentum last January.



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

The Case of Pyotr Yakir

As the informal leader of the "Democratic Movement," Pyotr Yakir for the past decade has been the most courageously outspoken representative of the hitherto tolerated Soviet domestic reform movement. There were two reasons for his ability to remain a free man while others who felt as he does were sent to jail or insane asylums: his strict adherence to the letter of the law and the fact that he enjoyed international fame as the son of a highly popular, well-known general who was framed and executed by Stalin in 1937. Yakir's only "crime" is that he fervently believes that only by "informing people of what is going on in our country" (and about the illegal acts of the KGB)---only by making a return to Stalinist "secrecy" impossible, can a return to Stalinist terror be made impossible.

The 49-year old Yakir practically grew up in the Stalinist forced labor camps. At age 14 he was swept up with his mother in the mass arrests of 1937, the year his father, Major-General Iona Yakir, was executed in Stalin's purge of the Red Army. His mother was "liquidated" later and Pyotr Yakir was released after 17 years during Khrushchev's anti-Stalin rehabilitation campaign. It is rare---and therefore especially ominous---for the KGB to re-arrest a former inmate of a Stalinist concentration camp.

Anthony Astrachan, in a 28 June Washington Post article on "The Yakir Case," cites a little-publicized letter that Yakir addressed to the 24th Party Congress in which he warned of "a dangerous tendency toward the rebirth of Stalinist methods of Government." Yakir scored the Party for answering a "flood" of letters expressing loyal criticisms with "at best silence and at worst judicial and extra-judicial repression akin to the Stalinist anti-democratic style. . .Who would think of writing to the United Nations or appealing to world public opinion if his own leadership gave him a convincing answer to serious questions bothering serious people?"

The Kremlin's ultimate answer was Pyotr Yakir's arrest. Should Yakir's case come to court, it will be the first political trial of such a well-known dissident since Vladimir Bukovsky's one-day trial in January. Pyotr Yakir protested Bukovsky's arrest and trial and now (provided he is judged sane enough to stand trial and does not just disappear behind the walls of the Serbsky Psychiatric Institute) he may have to argue in his own defense that it is the authorities themselves who violate the Soviet constitution with their acts of suppression.

Yakir apparently had a premonition that he might be arrested. Shortly before London Times correspondent David Bonavia was expelled from Moscow, Yakir told him: "If they beat me, I will say anything. I know that from my former experience in the camps. But you will know it will not be the real me speaking. Another



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
thing, I shall never in any circumstances commit suicide. So you will know that if they say I have done away with myself, someone else will have done me in."

The Campaign to Kill the Chronicle

The political event that triggered the current harsh KGB crackdown was a Communist Party Central Committee decree reportedly issued some time in December 1971 ordering a halt to the publication of the Chronicle of Current Events, the unofficial journal that primarily reports the facts concerning civil rights violations by Soviet authorities. The intense KGB secret police campaign during the first seven months of 1972 has resulted in such widespread searches of dissidents' homes that they have become routine. This rapidly rising tide of KGB repression, together with a heightened harrassment of non-Russian nationalities, has meant an intensification of the anti-intellectual smear campaign and increasing numbers of arrests and interrogations in Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Kharkov, Kiev, and in Siberia's Akadamgorodok (science city, where most of the USSR's advance research is carried out).

The KGB campaign to eliminate the Chronicle is referred to by the secret police as "criminal case No. 24." Despite all the arrests, only one trial is known to have taken place as of this writing. It was the trial in Leningrad of 26-year old astrophysicist Yuri Melnik who was sentenced 19 June to three years in a strict regime forced labor camp. Charged with "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda," Melnik pleaded guilty. A radio teletype machine had been found in his apartment at the time of his arrest.

Pyotr Yakir, before he was arrested, said in a telephone interview that was published in the 4 June London Sunday Telegraph that the campaign had succeeded in the Ukraine, where "even the families of those arrested are afraid to speak to each other. . . But they have not managed to silence Moscow." So far, however, the success of KGB action taken under the guise of "criminal case No. 24" is questionable. The Chronicle of Current Events thus far continues to publish practically on schedule, the two latest issues having appeared since Yakir's arrest.

The Ukrainian Nationalists

As Peter Reddaway writes in his latest book Uncensored Russia (American Heritage Press, 1972), it was the sentencing of 20 intellectuals in 1965 and 1966 that provoked the rebirth of a vigorous and independent Ukrainian public opinion. The well-known book by Vycheslav Chornovil exposing KGB methods used during the mid-1960's purges, published in the West as The Chornovil Papers, recorded and analyzed the fates of these people. An equally well-known work by critic Ivan Dzyuba, Internationalism or Russification? examined historically the issues which had so concerned them.



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

By mid-1968, following the issuance of a challenging and provocative letter signed by 139 Ukrainian intellectuals protesting the conduct of political trials both in Moscow and in the Ukraine, a general campaign of intimidation was begun. Last winter and spring saw the arrest and in some cases the re-arrests of most of the outspoken members of the democratic movement in the Ukraine. The 25th issue of the Chronicle of Current Events, which was circulating in mid-July, reported over 100 arrests in the Ukraine alone so far this year.

Among the long-standing leaders of the latest revival of Ukrainian national consciousness now awaiting or undergoing trial are Vycheslav Chornovil, Ivan Dzyuba, Ivan Svitlychny and his sister Nadiya Svitlychna. Typical of the severity that can be expected in the sentences meted out from these trials is that already given Danylo Shumuk, husband of Nadiya Svitlychna, who has been condemned to 10 years of forced labor in a strict regime camp and 25 years in exile.

Trumped up statements made by a Belgian student, Jaroslav Dobosch, and reported in the Kiev Pravda Ukrainy in early June are undoubtedly being used as evidence against those on trial. Dobosch was sent to the Ukraine by a right-wing emigre group, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, in order to contact some Ukrainian dissidents. He was arrested in January and held prisoner for five months. Instead of being tried he was made to give his statements at a press conference from which Western newsmen were barred and was then expelled. As soon as he got home to Belgium, Dobosch publicly retracted his statements made under duress.

A separate Ukrainian case involves two Canadian-born Ukrainians who were brought to the USSR as teenagers by their parents and who now, perhaps encouraged by the liberalization of Jewish emigration policies, are trying to get permission to emigrate to Canada. The two, Nadia Demidenko and Eugene Lenko, have Soviet-born spouses and children and all members of both families have applied for visas and consistently been refused.

The Kremlin's Greatest Fear

Probably the greatest single worry for the Soviet leadership is the nationalities problem and possibly also the effect that the Jewish emigration movement could have on other minorities. About 14,000 Jews were allowed to emigrate last year and about 30,000 to 40,000 are expected to leave this year. This Jewish success cannot but profoundly influence the non-Russian minorities who aspire to greater autonomy and the preservation of their national identities. In addition, the Jewish case might serve to inspire desires for emigration among Volga Germans, Crimean Tatars, the Meskhetians or other displaced minorities.

As the Chronicle of Current Events bears out, nationalist intellectuals and their supporters have recently become increasingly outspoken. And in Lithuania since May this year, there



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
have been four instances of self-immolation in protest of "Russification." The armed forces and militia had to be brought in from outside to quell the three-day riots that broke out in Kaunas following the funeral of the first Lithuanian youth who made of himself a torch of protest.

Last March 17,000 Roman Catholic Lithuanians petitioned United Nations Secretary General Waldheim to protest the religious discrimination that has been practiced against them since the Soviet Union absorbed Lithuania in 1940. The July riots in Kaunas, the most serious outbreak within the Soviet Union in recent years, were reported by dissident sources as being primarily motivated by nationalist feeling, but in Lithuania, nationalist and religious feeling most often overlap.

The Lithuanian protest is particularly noteworthy because Lithuanians are a much smaller, weaker nation than Germans, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks, or Poles. Actually, Lithuania typifies the Baltic states which have never reconciled themselves to "Russification." From Latvia last year 17 Communist Party officials addressed a letter to several leading communist parties including those of Yugoslavia, Romania, France, and Austria. The chief complaint in their 5,000 word letter was that the Soviet leaders are practicing "Great Russian Chauvinism" in seeking to force smaller ethnic groups such as Latvians, to assimilate with the Russians. It called on the foreign parties to use their influence with the Soviet leadership on behalf of all ethnic minorities in the Soviet Union.

The Policy Liberalized, But -

While permitting a mass exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union, the authorities have simultaneously meted out harsh punishment to those whom they will not let leave. Simultaneously, policy against the Zionist ferment in many of the country's Jewish communities has been hardened. Overall policy concerning Jewish immigration has been highly inconsistent, but on a case-to-case basis the authorities have been consistent in prohibiting from leaving either those who are too well known abroad or those whose talents are wanted at home.

In Moscow, for example, astronomer Kronid Lyubarsky was arrested after he applied to emigrate. The well-known ballet dancer Valeri Panov lost his spot as one of the top stars with the Kirov Ballet after he applied last spring to emigrate to Israel. He has since been twice imprisoned on charges of "hooliganism," Panov has gained international prominence despite an official ban prohibiting him from going on any of the Kirov foreign tours.

In London last June, Irina Markish appealed to Queen Elizabeth for help in obtaining an exit visa for her husband. Mrs. Markish had been granted a visa and had left the Soviet Union six months



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

earlier assuming her husband could follow. Instead, her husband David Markish, whose poet father was exterminated during the Stalinist post-war anti-Jewish purges, got his military call-up and was told he would never see his wife again. Mrs. Markish said her husband, also a poet and writer, had been told he could not leave the Soviet Union because his late father, Peretz Markish "had been famous and well-known abroad."

Artist Nathan Feingold was denied permission to emigrate on grounds that over 5 years ago, when he was working as a scientist, he had access to "secret" information. Viktor Perelman, top-ranking journalist with Literary Gazette, lost his job and was expelled from both the Party and Journalists' Union when he applied to emigrate to Israel. Officials told him his request was denied "because you have an intimate knowledge of the Soviet way of life."

Then there is the alarming case of Vladimir Markman in Sverdlovsk who after having been accused of collaborating with the Nazis in World War II, was arrested and imprisoned. Markman had been dismissed in 1970 from his post with an economics institute in Sverdlovsk after publicly protesting the Jewish hijack trials in Leningrad. He applied to emigrate to Israel and was denied permission. Later, when his friend Valeri Kukui was sentenced in Sverdlovsk to three years imprisonment, Markman, a witness in the case, was so indignant over the way pre-trial [illegible] evidence had been falsified in the court that he initiated an action against the judges. In April this year the press in Sverdlovsk accused Markman of having links with the Zionists who, it was asserted, had collaborated with the Nazis in the mass extermination of Jews. Markman publicly denied the allegation following which he was arrested and reportedly has been sentenced to three years imprisonment.

The Reaction from Abroad

The Journal of the International Committee for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR notes in its July issue that there is hardly any Soviet official or delegation leaving the USSR for foreign travel that is not at some time confronted with protests of one kind or another against human rights violations in the Soviet Union. Such incidents occurred during Premier Kosygin's visit to Canada and during Foreign Minister Gromyko's visits to Paris, Luxemburg, The Hague, and Brussels, during the pilgrimage of 800 Soviet tourists to the tomb of Karl Marx in London, and during the performance in Paris of the Red Army Orchestra at the international music festival. Recent demonstrations have been held in front of Soviet embassies in Paris, Brussels, and London and before United Nations Headquarters in New York and UNESCO's Paris headquarters. Just during May, the magazine says, 23 different actions took place in Great Britain alone.

In Frankfurt, the Bishops in exile of the Russian Orthodox Church issued a proclamation calling for freedom of worship for



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
their brethren in the USSR. From Rome, 33 leading European cultural figures including Ignatio Silone, Federico Fellini, Stephen Spender, and Iris Murdoch telegraphed Brezhnev to express concern over the fate of prominent author Vladimir Maksimov. In Brussels, the European Union of Young Christian Democrats protested at a press conference against religious persecutions in Lithuania and deportations to Siberia. In Paris, a group of intellectuals including Raymond Aron, Pierre Emmanuel, Julian Green and Armand Salacrou have created an international committee to denounce imprisonments in psychiatric hospitals and demand a retrial for Vladimir Bukovsky.

Also from Paris a group of prominent French intellectuals including the Romanian-born playwright Eugene Ionesco and Nobel Prize winner Rene Cassin in June sent an "anguished appeal" to the Soviet leaders on behalf of imprisoned Vladimir Bukovsky. The group expressed its "indignation over the arbitrary and illegal verdict" passed on Bukovsky and asked "all democratic peoples to join in an expression of sympathy" for him. Among those signing were philosopher Gabriel Marcel, director of Paris daily Figaro, Louis-Gabriel Robinet, former defense minister and Socialist Party leader Jules Moch, and the internationally known conductor Roberto Benzi.

Amnesty International, the non-political organization that concerns itself with political prisoners all over the world, has issued an appeal to supporters of civil liberties to write the Soviet government on behalf of ex-Major General Pyotr Grigorenko and to call for his release from the psychiatric hospital where he is imprisoned. Grigorenko has been held since May 1969 as the result of his efforts to defend the rights of the Crimean Tatars. "As far as we know," Amnesty said in its June newsletter, "this is one of the longest continuous periods of confinement in a psychiatric hospital that a dissident in the USSR has ever undergone." The 26th issue of the Chronicle of Current Events which was circulating as of mid-July reported that a government psychiatric panel had declared that Pyotr Grigorenko continues to need "medical care."

It was Vladimir Bukovsky's courageous activities in defense of dissidents who are confined in psychiatric hospitals that brought him his latest imprisonment and the harshest sentence yet meted out to a political dissident --- a total 12 years in prison, forced labor, and exile. Early in 1971, Bukovsky sent to the West 150 pages of material concerning six political prisoners diagnosed by Soviet psychiatrists as mentally irresponsible. Bukovsky asked Western psychiatrists to give their opinions as to whether the diagnoses were justified by the documentary evidence he had compiled.

Last spring, as one response to Bukovsky's plea, more than 80 French psychiatrists, psychologists, and other professional mental health specialists signed an appeal for "an international



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

commission of inquiry to work ceaselessly to shed all possible light on the contents of Bukovsky's documents." The appeal says in part that Soviet police-psychiatric practices "especially touches doctors who view any use of medical science by a political regime for purposes of coercion, cruelty, or even torture, instead of for therapeutic purposes, only as a serious misuse if not a real perversion."

Another appeal sent last spring from Western Europe and addressed to Soviet President Podgorny deplored conditions in the USSR's mammoth forced labor camp system with its some two million or more inmates and called for an international inspection team. The appeal had 500 signatories including two Nobel award winners, Professor Rene Cassin, Nobel Prize for Peace, and Professor Andre Lvov who is a Corresponding Member of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR. Signatories also included many members of European Parliaments, entertainers such as Johnny Halliday, authors and poets such as Maurice Careme, journalists, 18 Trade Union leaders who took part in the June Brussels meeting of the "Assembly on European Security and Cooperation," members of Amnesty International, representatives of youth organizations, and officers of the "International Federation for the Rights of Man."

This appeal called President Podgorny's attention to the ill treatment which political prisoners are protesting throughout the USSR. Exhausting labor, the absence or denial of medical care, insufficient food allowances, and the deprivation of family visits have reduced many prisoners to total despair. The signatories hope that President Podgorny will use his authority to humanize conditions in the corrective labor camps and prisons and to having them put under the control of the Supreme Soviet. They also call for authorization of visits to the Soviet Union by members of the World Health Organization, UN Commission on Human Rights, or the International Red Cross in order to inspect conditions in the forced labor camps.

The Need for Western Support

In an appeal for help from Western public opinion that he issued from Rome shortly after he was permitted to leave the Soviet Union, former Russian film director Yuri Shtein said: "I am not in any way calling for a cold war, let alone a hot one, nor even for any official interference in particular aspects of Soviet internal politics. But I am absolutely convinced that the voice of world public opinion has great significance today as regards defending the rights of Russia's 'dissenters,' and not only in defending their rights but, even more important, in preserving their lives. . . .Now when we see that the forces of reaction are not just perpetrating occasional excesses, but trying to launch a new offensive in my country, the burden of mutual responsibility lies on all people of good will. For, as the recent past has shown, the triumph of evil never remains isolated in one area, but contains an insidious danger for the peace and tranquility of



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

all the inhabitants of our single 'planet of people.'"

Yuri Shtein is one of the small group of dissidents formerly active in the Soviet Democratic Movement who have recently been granted exit visas from the USSR --- actually, a form of exile. While most of the group had at one time or another requested and been denied exit visas, one of their members who is considered one of the USSR's finest poets, Iosif Brodsky, reportedly never asked for one. Rome has become the temporary haven for some of these new political exiles. Probably the most distinguished member of the group, the brilliant mathematician, philosopher and poet Alexander Esenin-Volpin was locked up in a mental hospital when he first applied several years ago to leave the USSR. This time Volpin was given a 6-day deadline to be out of the country and was prohibited from bringing with him his bride of a few months.

Artist Yuri Titov was allowed to leave with his family and 64 of his paintings but when the paintings were uncrated most had been irrepairably damaged by sulphuric acid. The emigre group issued a statement which denounced this as an act of political vandalism. Another in the group is author and orientalist Yuri Glazov who decried the despoiling of Titov's paintings as an act equally as barbarous as that of the madman who attacked Michelangelo's Pieta.

Commenting on the Soviet decision to permit the emigration of himself and others in this group, Yuri Glazov said he was sure the authorities decided that exile to the West was the best way to handle dissidents since "putting them in camps only provokes more protests in Russia and outside." What impact their departure will have on the Democratic Movement at home is unclear. Certainly Soviet authorities are looking forward not only to an eventual diminishing of public interest in news about Volpin and others in the emigre group but also to what they hope will be the demoralizing effect of the group's departure on the dissident centers at home. On this latter point, Alexander Esenin-Volpin is highly optimistic. "The growth of public opinion in Russia," he said during an interview in Rome, "cannot be stopped: for every single individual leaving the Soviet Union, two new ones will come up. Our friends know that we had no choice but to leave and that we shall continue our struggle as vigorously outside as we did inside the Soviet Union."

The Rome correspondent for The Economist comments that the chances are that Mr. Volpin's prediction will prove to be right. The struggle in the Soviet Union is nurtured by forces stronger than the leadership provided by a few individuals. While Lenin's activities in London and Geneva 60 years ago did not topple the tsarist regime, they were often invaluable to his comrades at home. What with modern communications, an increasingly alert Western public opinion, and a marked sensitivity to it on the part of the Soviet regime, the role of individuals such as Volpin



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

is bound to grow. In the end the Soviet leadership may well find this newest tactic of "getting rid of the troublemakers" more a mistake than a blessing.

The Case of Vladimir Maksimov

One of the first acts by the members of the Democratic Movement in exile in Rome on behalf of their comrades at home was to help Vladimir Maksimov, 40-year old author of a remarkable work that has been published in the West as "Sem'dney tvoreniya" (The Seven Days of Creation). An author whose works have been published officially in the past in the Soviet Union, Maksimov was one of the three or four dozen professional writers who signed a declaration protesting the 1968 trials of authors Ginzburg and Galanskov. For this he was given an official "warning" by the Writers' Union.

The following year Maksimov joined six other Moscow writers to protest to the leadership of the Writers' Union the expulsion from the union of so great an author as Alexander Solzhenitsyn "by a group of obscure literateurs from Ryazan." Now Maksimov too is on the verge of being expelled from the Writers' Union for persistently refusing to denounce the Western publication of his novel which came out last year in Germany in Russian and is soon to appear in translation in some 8 countries. Peter Reddaway notes in The Times that The Seven Days of Creation is considered a masterpiece by critics.

Vladimir Maksimov also played a part in the Democratic Movement by taking on Vladimir Bukovsky as his secretary during the time that Bukovsky was under threat of re-arrest and spoke out strongly in Bukovsky's defense before the latter's trial. For these acts, Maksimov is also now being threatened with internment in a mental hospital. Thanks to the efforts of his friends in Rome, the cause of Vladimir Maksimov has been taken up by several prominent Italian authors including Ignazio Silone and Giancarlo Vigorelli.



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

FOR BACKGROUND USE ONLY

21 August 1972

SOVIET REPRESSION:
The Victims

In the Soviet Union, legal protest or manifestations of disagreement with official policy are more often than not squelched by extra-judicial means: dismissal from one's job with either resultant unemployment or ostracism from professions for which one has been trained; a summons for interrogation by the KGB; arrest or threat of arrest; imprisonment; sentencing to forced slave labor, to enforced exile, or to imprisonment in an institution for the insane; and, most recently, exile from one's country. Below are summarized the best known cases of individuals thus affected since last January when the KGB began its current, massive wave of repression:

In early August, Andrey Sakharov addressed an open letter to the Soviet Minister of Health concerning VLADIMIR BORISOV and Viktor Fainberg who, he said, "are dying in a Leningrad psychiatric prison hospital" and "remain in solitary confinement, deprived of books and writing materials." Vladimir Borisov is an electrician and a member of the Action Group for the Defense of Civil Rights. From 1964 to 1968 he was in a psychiatric hospital prison in Leningrad. In May 1969, shortly after his release he signed the first dissident appeal addressed to the United Nations and a letter in defense of Pyotr Grigorenko. For these acts he was arrested, tried, found to be of unsound mind and recommitted to the Leningrad psychiatric prison. In spring of 1971 Borisov joined Viktor Fainberg in a hunger strike that lasted 81 days.

Leningrad poet, IOSIF BRODSKY, considered the finest living Russian poet has left the Soviet Union under police pressure. Most connoisseurs of Russian literature consider Brodsky's poetry to be apolitical but he was a witness in the first political trial of literary figures, that of Sinyavsky and Daniel. In 1964 he was convicted of "parasitism" and served 18 months in a forced labor camp. After returning from a period of enforced Arctic exile, he spent 7 years writing and translating for unofficial periodicals in Leningrad. Although Jewish by Soviet definition, Brodsky has never shown interest in Jewish culture or of wishing to emigrate to Israel. Authorities reportedly threatened him with unspecified punishment if he did not accept an invitation from Israeli poets to visit them. On the day of his departure, Brodsky appealed to Leonid Brezhnev for the right to return and live out his creative life in his homeland.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

In January, following a one-day trial, VLADIMIR BUKOVSKY was ordered imprisoned for the fourth time in nine years. His was the harshest sentence yet given a Soviet dissident -- a total 12 years in prison, forced labor camp, and exile. Bukovsky's activities since his last release from prison in 1970 caused him to become one of the more prominent among the members of the Democratic Movement. They consisted of writing an open letter to Greek composer Mikis Theodorakis inviting him to intercede with Soviet authorities on behalf of the USSR's political prisoners and denouncing in a filmed interview later carried by CBS television ("Voices from the Russian Underground") the practice of putting political dissenters in mental hospitals -- a practice to which he had also been subjected. After he urgently appealed in March 1971 to Western psychiatrists to investigate Soviet practices he was arrested. During his one-day trial, Bukovsky told the court that he only regretted that he had done "so little" for freedom in the Soviet Union while he was last out of prison.

Physicist VALERI CHALIDZE is a cofounder with fellow scientists, Sakharov and Tverdokhlebov of the unofficial Soviet Human Rights Committee. A man of great energy, Chalidze has written numerous treatises including "Class Analysis in Soviet Law" and analyses of the situation in Czechoslovakia and has edited several issues in manuscript form of Social Problems, the legal journal of the Human Rights Committee. In 1970 Chalidze wrote Czechoslovak Party Chief Gustav Husak warning against party and judicial repressions he feared might be taken against the leaders under Dubcek. On 16 August this year he again addressed an open letter to President Svoboda appealing for the pardon of Czechoslovak's sentenced during the July-August political trials in Prague. Chalidze called on Svoboda to "use his constitutional right of pardon." In July Chalidze was twice called in by the KGB to be accused of "masked anti-Soviet propaganda" and to be threatened with arrest.

VYCHESLAV CHORNOVIL was among several of the Ukrainians arrested in January in Lvov whose political trial may be imminent. A former TV journalist in his 30's, Chornovil was first arrested in 1967 after he had compiled and circulated as samizdat a documented account of KGB methods used in mass arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals in the mid-1960's. The manuscript was published in the West in 1968 as The Chornovil Papers.

IVAN DZYUBA, literary critic and author of Internationalism or Russification?, was arrested in January in Lvov. His trial also may be imminent.



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

A week or so before the arrests of Sinyavski and Daniel in Moscow, numerous young intellectuals had been arrested in the Ukraine. Dzyuba, together with VYCHESLAV CHORNOVIL staged a protest demonstration in a Kiev theater. In 1966 he spoke at Babi Yar, calling Soviet antisemitism "the fruit and satellite of agelong slavery and lack of culture, the first and inevitable offspring of political despotism." His book, published in the West in 1969, is an examination of the Leninist policy on nationalities.

In early August Andrey Sakharov wrote the Soviet Minister of Health concerning the fate of Vladimir Borisov and VIKTOR FAINBERG who, he said, "are dying in a Leningrad psychiatric prison" and "remain in solitary confinement, deprived of books and writing materials." Fainberg, a fine arts specialist, graduated from Leningrad University in 1968. On 25 August 1968 he was one of the seven young people who staged a sit-down demonstration at noon in Red Square to protest the sending of Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia. He was so badly beaten and knocked toothless in the course of being arrested that he was unable to stand trial. He was declared to be of unsound mind and sent to a Leningrad psychiatric prison where in the spring of 1971 he joined Vladimir Borisov in a hunger strike that lasted 81 days.

YURI GLAZOV was permitted to leave the USSR this spring after previously having his requests for an exit visa denied. Writer, historian, and prominent orientalist Glazov said in an interview in Rome, to where he emigrated, that he was sure that Soviet authorities "had decided that exile to the West was a better way to handle dissidents... Sending them to camps provokes more protests in Russia and outside." In 1968 Glazov was dismissed from his job at the Institute of the Peoples of Asia for having signed protest letters and an appeal to the Budapest conference of communist parties.

In March 1969, former Major General PYOTR GRIGORENKO circulated an appeal to Soviet citizens calling on "all Soviet people, without doing anything rash or hasty, and by all legal methods, to bring about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and the renunciation of interference in her internal affairs." Two months later Grigorenko was arrested in Tashkent for taking part in a demonstration in support of the Crimean Tatars. He was charged with "slandering" the Soviet Union and its social system. In October 1969, Grigorenko was committed to a mental hospital for observation and three months later was declared "insane" and hospitalized in Chernyakovsk for "treatment." The latest issue, circulating as of mid-July, of the Chronicle of Current Events reports that a psychiatric panel had declared that Grigorenko continues to need additional "medical care."

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

In Odessa, NINA STROKATOVA, microbiologist and wife of one of the best known Ukrainian political prisoners, was tried May 14th and sentenced to four years' imprisonment in a strict regime forced labor camp. Her husband, SVYATOSLAV KARAVANSKY, who has been in prison continuously since 1944 except for a short period between 1960 and 1965, is a linguistic scholar and heterodox writer of political themes. Presently being held in the prison at Vladimir, Karavansky has contrived to keep on writing articles and poems, some of which have reached the West. He is due for release in 1979. Nina Strokatova's only crime has been activity undertaken in defense of her husband.

BENJAMIN LEVICH, a 55-year old chemist, scholar. and member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, is the highest-ranking Soviet scientist to have applied for a visa to Israel. After he applied last March, he was demoted and his son, a 24-year old astrophysicist was conscripted for military duty despite chronic physical disabilities and despite the normal exemption granted scientists with Ph.D.'s. At an unusual press conference held 15 August in Moscow, Levich read a statement signed by himself and 9 other scientists and scholars which protested Jewish emigration policy under which Jews were divided "according to their educational and intellectual level...The higher the level, the more difficult it is to get a visa." This policy, according to the statement, threatened to turn Jews into "a new category of human beings...the slaves of the twentieth century."

Author VLADIMIR MAKSIMOV is being threatened with internment in a mental hospital and is on the verge of being expelled from the Writers' Union for persistently refusing to denounce the Western publication of his novel The Seven Days of Creation. The book, which is regarded by critics as a masterpiece was published in Germany last year in Russian and is soon to be in translation in several countries. The hospital threat provoked thirty-three leading European intellectuals to telegraph Brezhnev saying they are "deeply worried about the fate of Maksimov." Among signatories are Gunther Grass, Iris Murdoch, Federico Fellini, Stephen Spender and Angus Wilson.

Eminent Soviet biochemist and gerontologist ZHORES MEDVEDEV was temporarily committed to a mental hospital two years ago because of his protests against the stultifying effect of Soviet bureaucracy on Russian scientific progress. Medvedev, who was freed from the insane asylum only after the intercession of scientists in the USSR and abroad, is the twin brother of Roy Medvedev, who has published a documentary history of the



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Stalinist purges as well as a book describing the persecution directed against his brother. Zhores Medvedev was taken into police custody on July 2 and forced to return to Moscow after being barred from the Ninth International Congress of Gerontology. Dr. Medvedev, pioneer in the study of the aging process, had been invited to deliver a paper at the meeting of gerontologists but the Soviet Organizing Committee eliminated him from the program. His disappearance caused consternation among more than 2,000 delegates from 43 countries. Scientists earlier had surmised that Dr. Medvedev had been forced to return home. One of them received a telegram from him expressing regret at not being able to have another meeting "because of earlier arrangements with Profess. R. Kidnaper." They took this to mean "Professional Russian Kidnaper" or the Secret Police.

In Leningrad, Mr. YURI MELNIK, an astrophysicist in the Soviet space program, aged 26, was sentenced on June 19 to three years in a strict regime camp on charges of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" to which he pleaded guilty. When the police arrested him in January they found a radio teletype machine in his flat. This is the first trial to be held in connection with "criminal case No. 24" a case which is intended to suppress the unauthorized journal The Chronicle of Current Events and which has led to widespread arrests and interrogations.

BULAT S. OKUDZHAVA first made a name for himself in the early 1960's as a composer of ballads written for guitar. His songs have a strongly revisionist tinge since they deal with personal problems and are open to interpretation as being anti-militarist. The Soviet press has accused Okudzhava of "harmful pacifism, of dilettantish attitudes," etc. In late June this year Okudzhava was expelled from the Communist Party for "conduct unbecoming Communist writers" but was permitted to retain his membership in the Writers' Union. Okudzhava, some of whose works have appeared in the West, has steadfastly refused to condemn his "political errors." As part of the pressure campaign against Okudzhava, his 18-year old son was conscripted for military duty before he could take his final examinations.

VALERI PANOV lost his job as premier dancer with the Kirov Ballet after he applied last spring to emigrate to Israel. He has since been twice jailed on charges of "hooliganism." Panov, the most highly decorated artist of the Soviet Union ever to ask to leave, was given a subtle warning. His head was shaved and he was confined in a cell with amputees and cripples. A letter smuggled out by a friend to Clive Barnes, New York Times drama and dance critic, said that Panov, as a dancer whose art



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

is tied up with the use of his body, "understood this malevolent message." The 33-year-old dancer, inactive since his dismissal from the Kirov in April, also indicated that he expected to be assigned soon to menial labor under Soviet laws against "parasitism." Either choice - menial labor or prison - would, in the opinion of his closest associates, destroy the career of one of the Soviet Union's most talented and highly decorated artists.

Top ranking journalist VIKTOR PERELMAN lost his job with Literaturnaya Gazeta within hours after he had applied for an exit visa. His request was turned down, the authorities told him, "because you have an intimate knowledge of the Soviet way of life."

Ukrainian mathematician and philosopher LEONID PLYUSHCH, one of the founding members of the Action Group for Civil Rights has signed numerous letters, petitions, and appeals to the United Nations. He has been one of the bolder and more outspoken protesters of political trials and arrests in the Ukraine and as a result subject to frequent searches and KGB interrogations. Plyushch was arrested in Kiev last spring.

ANDREY SAKHAROV, popularly known as the father of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, first warned in the mid-1960's of the criminal character of a possible nuclear war. After his remarkable essay of June 1968, "Thoughts on Progress, Peaceful Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom" was published in the West, he was dismissed from his post as Chief Consultant to the State Committee for Atomic Energy and returned to his own (Lebedev) institute where no security pass is needed. In 1970 he formed, with physicist colleagues Chalidze and Tverdokhlebov, the unofficial Soviet Human Rights Committee whose aim is to study the problems of rights and to help the authorities to introduce desirable reforms. One of a handful of Soviet intellectuals that the regime has been unable to coerce, in June Sakharov issued a new appeal calling on the Soviet leadership to liberalize Soviet society and protect the Soviet people from a resurgence of Stalinism. Included in Sakharov's proposals are the evolution, not the overthrow of socialism, the passage of a law to guarantee any Soviet Republic the right of secession, and the inadequate study given to the military-industrial complex in the Soviet Union and other Communist nations to be remedied. Sakharov's emphasis on law and legality reflects his role as the principal spokesman for Russia's dissident democratic movement whose supporters contend there is nothing wrong with Soviet laws as they are written



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

but that the Government has chosen to ignore or distort law to further personal ambitions and protect the privileges of the ruling class.

The campaign to discredit world renowned author and Nobel Prize winner ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN gathered momentum last spring with the publication in Literaturnaya Gazeta of almost a full newspaper page of letters denouncing Solzhenitsyn's "hatred" of the Bolshevik Revolution and trying to link him with anti-Soviet emigre groups. On 4 April Solzhenitsyn made his first personal and on-the-record statement to Western newsmen in almost 10 years. He said he had been systematically slandered since 1965 by an official propaganda campaign intended to "drive me out of society or out of the country, throw me in a ditch or send me to Siberia, or have me dissolve in an alien fog." The 53-year old writer accused Soviet authorities of stupidity and shortsightedness, charging that the Soviet Union is ruled today by "Force and Violence." Nevertheless, he said, creativity in Russian literature has not been extinguished and he looks towards the day when those who now slander him "will personally answer for this in court." In talking about his work, the author said that he feels: "I am working for Russia, and Russia is helping me." He announced that more than 1 million dollars in royalties he has earned in the West are to be spent on "the general welfare of my country" under terms of a will he has written. Asked how it felt to be a celebrity in the West, the novelist answered: "I would prefer to be widely published in my own country!" He also said that he could live and work only in Russia.

In mid-January this year, KGB raids in Lvov and Kiev resulted in the arrests of 13 Ukrainian intellectual dissidents, among them literary critic IVAN SVITLYCHNY. His sister, NADIYA SVITLYCHNYwas reported arrested on 19 May. Both Svitlychny and his sister have long been active in the Ukrainian nationalist movement. Ivan Svitlychny was held in prison without trial from 1965 to 1966 and later subjected to KGB searches and interrogations. His sister Nadiya was dismissed from her job as a librarian in Kiev in 1969 because of a protest letter she signed. In the trials underway in Kiev as of mid-July, Nadiya's husband DANYLO SHUMUK has been sentenced to 10 years forced labor and 25 years exile.

ALEXANDER ESENIN-VOLPIN, a brilliant logician and legal expert, has been a fearless dissenter since Stalin's day: in 1959 he sent abroad a philosophical treatise and a collection of his poems; in 1965 he was one of the founders of the now traditional Constitution Day demonstrations; in 1966 he wrote about the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial; and in 1967 he gave evidence at the trial of



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Vladimir Bukovsky. At intervals since 1949 he has been incarcerated in mental hospitals. Ultimately he was always released because of the pressure of high-powered colleagues and other intellectuals. In June this year the Soviet regime "granted" Mr. Volpin an exit visa; he was told that he had six days to settle his affairs and that he should leave Russia for good. He has taken up residence in Rome.

YURI TITOV, architect and religious painter, was a supporter of the Action Group for the Defense of Civil Rights, active dissident and signer of protests including a letter sent in September 1969 to the World Council of Churches protesting the arrest and imprisonment of religious writer Anatoliy Levitin-Krasnov. In 1971 he was incarcerated in Moscow's Kashchenko Psychiatric Hospital. In June this year he was forced to emigrate from the USSR. Permitted to leave Russia with his family and 64 of his paintings, Titov emigrated to Rome. Upon uncrating the paintings in Rome, he discovered they had been sprayed with sulphuric acid and were more than half damaged.

PYOTR YAKIR, historian, associate of Vladimir Bukovsky in the democratic movement, and son of a popular general purged by Stalin in 1937, is one of the best known leaders of the protest movement in Russia today. In January the KGB seized some 3,000 documents, clippings and books from his apartment. Six months later Yakir was arrested and charged with "anti-constitutional activities." Yakir maintains that he fights for the de-Stalinization of Soviet society and that he does so within the letter of the law. On 9 July, 7 leading Soviet civil rights advocates protested the arrest of Yakir and demanded that he be freed on bail as Angela Davis was before her trial in California. Citing the Davis Case, which was widely reported in the Soviet press, Yakir's friends wrote: "Long before she was brought to trial on charges of being an accessory to murder, she was permitted bail and given a provisional release from prison." Western observers in Moscow say that if Yakir is brought to trial, it will be one of the most significant political trials since the days of Stalin.



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

SOVIET REPRESSION:
Index of Attachments


| | Page |
|---|---|
| "Brezhnev, Yakir and The West," Soviet Analyst, 6 July 1972 | 1 - 2 |
| "Soviet Rights Group Threatened by Police," Sunday Star, 30 July 1972 | 2 |
| "KGB Warns Dissidents on Anti-Soviet Activity," Washington Post, 30 July 1972 | 3 |
| "Political Rebels Dying," The Guardian, 3 August 1972 | 3 - 4 |
| "Physicist Challenges Kremlin," Charlotte Saikowski, Christian Science Monitor, 23 June 1972 | 4 - 5 |
| "URSS: Une Societe en Danger de Mort," Andrei Sakharov, L'Express, 7-14 August 1972 | 6 - 8 |
| "The Sakharov Memorandum," New York Times 18 August 1972 | 8A-8C |
| "The Yakir Case: Dissent vs Authority," Anthony Astrachan, Washington Post, 28 June 1972 | 9 |
| "Soviets Tighten Disciplining of Dissidents," Paul Wohl Christian Science Monitor, 26 June 1972 | 10-11 |
| "KGB Steps Up Its Campaign Against Dissidents," Peter Reddaway, The Times, 13 June 1972 | 11 |
| "Russians Launch Biggest Drive Against Internal Dissent Since Death of Stalin," Peter Reddaway, The Times, 28 June 1972 | 12 |
| "Lithuanian Troubles Jolt the Kremlin," Paul Wohl, Christian Science Monitor, 30 June 1972 | 13-14 |
| "Arrests by KGB Continue in Ukraine," Intercontinental Press, 19 June 1972 | 14-15 |


Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0


| | Page |
|---|---|
| "Leninism and Nationality," Soviet Analyst, 30 July 1972 | 15 |
| "Nationalism in the Soviet Union," Neue Zeurcher Zeitung, 2 April 1972 | 16-24 |
| "Unrest Is Spurring Soviet to Meld Its 100 Nationalities," Theodore Shabad, New York Times, 31 July 1972 | 24-25 |
| "Soviet Underground Urges Strikes to Raise Standards," New York Times, 20 June 1972 | 25-26 |
| "Inside Russia: Rare Voices of Protest," Newsweek, 26 June 1972 | 26-28 |
| "Ask Letters in Behalf of Pyotr Grigorenko," Intercontinental Press, 26 June 1972 | 28 |
| "Un Appel de la Section Suisse de 'Amnesty International'," Revue de la Presse Suisse, 7 July 1972 | 29 |
| "Call for Inquiry on Soviet Police-Psychiatry," Intercontinental Press, 12 June 1972 | 30-34 |
| "Jewish Emigration," Soviet Analyst, 22 June 1972 | 34-35 |
| "Soviet Dancer Said to Despair," New York Times, 2 July 1972 | 35-36 |
| "It Isn't Only Jews Russia Is Letting Go," The Economist, 17 June 1972 | 36-37 |
| "Russian Dissenter Appeals to the West," Peace News, 23 June 1972 | 37-38 |
| "Intrigue Enlivens Conference in Kiev," Washington Post, 9 July 1972 | 38-39 |
| "In the Dark Ages of Psychiatry," The Economist, 8 July 1972 | 39-40 |
| "Notes from Soviet Asylums - The Bukovsky Papers," National Review, 9 June 1972 | 40-44 |


Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0


| | Page |
|---|---|
| "The Kremlin vs Solzhenitsyn," Soviet Analyst, 27 April 1972 | 44-46 |
| "Russians Against The Kremlin," Michael Bourdeaux Elga Eliaser, David Floyd, John Miller, Ronald Payne, Stephen Constant, four-part series: | 46-61 |
| "Flights Into Israel," Sunday Telegraph 14 May 1972 | 47-50 |
| "The Price They Pay for Protest," Sunday Telegraph, 21 May 1972 | 50-54 |
| "Martyrs of Religious Protest," Sunday Telegraph, 28 May 1972 | 54-57 |
| "Leaders Tell of Fight for Human Rights in Russia," Sunday Telegraph, 4 June 1972 | 57-61 |


Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

SOVIET ANALYST, London
6 July 1972

CPYRGHT

# Brezhnev, Yakir and the West

The arrest of Pyotr Yakir on 21 June 1972 may serve to illustrate clearly, and put beyond cavil and misinterpretation, the current policies of the Soviet leadership. We have drawn attention in past issues to the recent series of scattered arrests, certifications as insane, and so on, as part of a campaign of increasing rigour against the dissident and democratic elements in the Soviet Union. Yakir had hitherto been to some degree protected, in spite of his selfless devotion to civil liberty, by the fact that his very name symbolises both the Stalin terror which destroyed his famous father and the rehabilitations of the Khrushchev period, and that he has enjoyed some residual protection from Army and other figures with whom such arguments still carried weight. His arrest signifies, therefore, a further decision taken at the highest level (and we can be sure that his case was discussed in the Politburo itself) to demonstrate and extend the new and much harder line against liberal activity.

As we wrote in SOVIET ANALYST No. 8, confusion had arisen in the West about a new "soft line" which had supposedly triumphed in the Kremlin. Above all, the recent agreements with the USA were seen as part and parcel of the defeat of a "hard line" general attitude among the leadership. We noted that the demotion of Shelest, widely misinterpreted in the West as a defeat for a "hard liner" internally as well as externally, in fact meant the removal of the man who in his fief in the Ukraine had actually conducted a policy incomparably less oppressive towards local dissidence than that in favour in Moscow. It must now be absolutely clear that the line of Brezhnev and the Politburo majority is one of seeking an element of truce with the West, and at the same time tightening the dictatorship within the USSR.

There need have been no surprise about this. As we noted in SOVIET ANALYST No. 1, the speeches of Brezhnev and others, over the past years and right up to the present, have been full of the strongest assurances that there could be no "ideological truce", no rapprochement in principle, between the Soviet Union and the West—that, on the contrary, the international struggle must continue unabated. Mr. Brian Crozier's contribution to our current issue develops this point.

It has often been believed in the West that summit meetings, treaties, trade and so forth, would go with a general softening, even a crumbling, of Soviet intransigence. This has never proved to be the case. And the leaders are being logical rather than not in turning especially strongly against the representatives of democratic ideas while they themselves are manoeuvring for a truce and for other benefits in the international field. In that field, they have now obtained certain advantages—(and parenthetically, we may now feel that they have learnt something from experience, and may revise to some extent estimates of their incapacity based on that incompetent handling of international matters which left them faced with hostility from every direction).

The dissident movement in Russia is not, indeed, yet crushed. The new issue of the *Chronicle of Current Events* has after all appeared in Moscow, though it seems clear that the KGB is now determined to stop it, and is more likely to succeed with every arrest. There are important figures, with stronger defences in their reputations and connections, in the political debit to be incurred by arresting them, than Yakir's. In particular, there is Alexander Solzenitsyn: though it may be possible largely to isolate him. And, on the other side, there is Academician Andrei Sakharov, the atomic physicist, and his associates. Whether the authorities are prepared as yet to move against them remains to be seen; and it will no doubt partly depend on reactions to the Yakir case.

Meanwhile, the "creeping Stalinism" which Yakir noted some years ago creeps steadily on. Every year is, in the words of the Soviet joke, "an average year—worse than last year, better than next".

From the Western point of view, we are once again being shown the basic fact of modern international politics: that the Soviet Union remains in principle wholly irreconcilable. Truces and

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

arrangements can be made. These are both necessary and useful. All the same, the fact remains that the USSR is, by its own volition, a siege polity. A stable and properly based world peace—not a Utopian condition of total fraternity, but a relationship at least no more hostile than those now prevailing among the non-Communist states—cannot arise until this condition of siege ends and there is a free influx and efflux of ideas —and travellers. When and if the European Security Conference meets, the main aim of the Western negotiators must surely be to put the maximum pressure on the Russians to back up their verbal assurances of peace and friendship by at least some beginning of such genuine traffic, without which detente means little in the longer run. Doubtless the Russians are unlikely, in their present mood, to accede. But at least it should be ensured that they do not treat such a conference simply as a free propaganda run for the old idea that all substantial concessions must be made by the West. The assault on Yakir is part of an offensive against the whole conception of free and peaceful debate on matters of principle, whether conducted across or within frontiers. The Western Governments should make it clear, both to the Soviet leaders and to such of their own citizens who may have sunk prematurely into a "deep dream of peace", that a true detente, as against a condition of vigilant truce, cannot be arrived at while this attitude persists.

SUNDAY STAR, Washington
30 July 1972

CPYRGHT

*KGB CRACKS DOWN*

# Soviet Rights Group Threatened by Police

CPYRGHT

MOSCOW (AP) — The Committee on Human Rights, founded 21 months ago by three prominent physicists as an unofficial watchdog over Soviet law and its abuse by authorities, may be the next target of the secret police.

Valery N. Chalidze, a founder of the group, said in an interview that a secret police officer summoned him twice this month, told him the committee had engaged in "well masked anti-Soviet activity," and threatened him with "repression," Chalidze said this means arrest.

"I have always written to protest the misuse of the law, or to suggest improvement in the law," the 33-year-old physicist said. "If I'm arrested for that, it means you can't do that any more in this country.

". . . I've been trying to help the Soviet state, and now I'm told that this is anti-Soviet. I feel the situation is worse than it was a year ago."

Early this year the KGB — secret police — began a concerted drive to uproot dissent. Hundreds of persons have been questioned or arrested in an effort to crush the underground Chronicle of Current Events, organ of the so-called Democratic Movement.

On June 21, KGB detectives arrested historian Pyotr Yakir, one of the driving forces of the movement. He is in Moscow's Lefortovo Prison awaiting trial on charges of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

The committee was organized in November 1970 by Chalidze and fellow physicists Andrei D. Sakharov, developer of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, and Andrei N. Tverdokhlebov.

Later, mathematician Igor R. Shafarevich became a member, and Nobel Prize winning novelist Alexander I. Solzhenitsyn and writer and balladeer Alexander Galich were elected corresponding members.

"Our work is to continue the study of Soviet law and help the Soviet authorities perfect the laws and judicial procedure," Chalidze asserted. He said the committee's activity is aimed at creating a concept of the law as a separate entity not subject to political expediency.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

WASHINGTON POST
30 July 1972

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

# KGB Warns Dissidents On Anti-Soviet Activities

By Robert G. Kaiser
Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, July 29—A high-ranking KGB officer has accused the Soviet Committee for Human Rights of contributing to anti-Soviet propoganda, a potentially serious accusation against the group led by Andrei Sakharov, a distinguished Soviet physicist.

The KGB's warning came in a recent session with Valeri N. Chalidze, a young physicist and associate of Sakharov's. Chalidze disclosed in an interview that the KGB questioned him twice, on July 5 and 7.

Perhaps because of Sakharov's renown as "the father of the Soviet hydrogen bomb," the human rights committee has largely escaped official persecution since its founding in November 1970. But Chalidze does not have Sakharov's international reputation. The committee has only four members, and its work has consisted of public statements on Soviet laws and legal proceedings.

Chalidze's two sessions with a senior KGB official, the assistant director of the National Department of Investigation, followed several months of apparently intensified secret police crackdown on political dissidents.

In an interview in his room in a communal Moscow apartment Chalidze said he thought that official pressure on dissidents was increasing markedly.

**Situation Worse**

"I feel that the situation is worse than it was a year ago," he said.

On July 5 he was personally threatened with "repression," Chalidze said, which he interpreted as a threat of arrest.

"The situation must be bad," he said. "I have always written protests against the misuse of the law, or suggesting improvements of the law. If I'm arrested for that it means you can't do that any more in this country," he said.

Sakharov has become increasingly outspoken of late. In June he released a memorandum to Communist Party leader Leonid I. Brezhnev which said in part:

**'Hidden Cruelty'**

"Our society is infected with apathy, hypocrisy, narrow-minded egoism, hidden cruelty. The majority of the representatives of its highest strata—the party and government administrative apparatus, the most successful strata of the inteligensia—hang on tenaciously to their open and secret privileges and are deeply indifferent to violations of human rights, to the interests of progress, and to the security of future mankind . . ."

Chalidze said he personally had never engaged in direct attacks on the Soviet system, but had concentrated instead on ways of strengthening the legal protection of human rights.

He said he had been "deeply affected" by the arrest of Pyotr Yakir, a prominent dissident and son of a Soviet general shot in Stalin's purges, who was picked up by the KGB last month.

Chalidze said he had not received any mail from abroad for months, although he knows from people he has talked to by long-distance telephone that hundreds of letters, including many that were registered, have been sent to him.

**Awaiting Letter**

One letter he is waiting for now, he said, is an invitation to lecture next fall at New York University Law School. He said he would like to accept this invitation, and hopes Soviet authorities will allow him to go.

Chalidze's phone has been cut off twice in recent months, the first time during President Nixon's visit, when many political dissidents here found their phones suddenly out of order. Chalidze shares his phone with five other families in the communal apartment, so they lose service whenever he does.

"I don't know what is worse," Chalidze said with a small grin, "an unpleasant interview with the KGB, or bad relations with your neighbors in a communal apartment." In a communal flat, all the residents share one kitchen and bathroom, and most families have only one room of their own.

His young wife Vera, a granddaughter of Maxim Litvinov, Soviet minister of foreign affairs during the 1930s, is unable to get work or a place in a university, though she has done very well on entrance exams, he said.

Chalidze had responsible work as a leader of several researchers in a physics laboratory here, but a year ago the laboratory stripped him of all responsibilities, and he quit.

He now works in a small laboratory, but he is not engaged in important research.

THE GUARDIAN, MANCHESTER
3 August 1972

CPYRGHT

# Political rebels 'dying'

The Soviet nuclear physicist, Andrei Sakharov, has said in a letter to the Russian Health Minister, Mr. Petrovsky, that two political dissidents are dying in solitary confinement in a Leningrad mental hospital.

Copies of Sakharov's letter, dated Tuesday, reached Western journalists today.

The letter said Viktor Feinberg and Vladimir Borisov "are dying in a Leningrad psychiatric prison hospital" and "remain in solitary confinement. They are deprived of books and writing materials."

Sakharov, one of the developers of the Soviet H-bomb, and a co-founder of the unofficial Committee on Human Rights, told Petrovsky: "Without your intervention as well as the world public's, no force is capable of saving them."

## Protest

Feinberg, an art critic, was sent to hospital after participating in a 1968 Red Square demonstration against the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Borisov, an engineer, wrote a letter to the United Nations protesting against political

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

arrests in the Soviet Union. Dissident sources said both staged an 80-day hunger strike in 1971 to protest against hospital conditions and the Soviet practice of dewtaining sane political dissenters in mental hospitals.

Sakharov's letter said they had "held a number of hunger strikes as a sign of protest against prison administration arbitrariness." The letter said the two men were transferred in January to the Serbsky Psychiatric Institute in Moscow for a three-month psychiatric examination.

The Serbsky institute's committee ruled in April that they were "no longer in need" of treatment, the letter said — but a Leningrad court, "in an astonishing ruling," overturned the committee's decision.

Also in Moscow, four people, including two Canadian-born Ukrainians, today continued a sit-in' protest at the Canadian Embassy after spending their second night in the building.

The four, who are protesting against the Soviet authorities' refusal to let them leave the country with their families, said before they went into the embassy on Monday that they would stage a hunger strike.

Today they were understood to have kept their word, and to have taken nothing but water since starting the sit-in. UPI and Reuter.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
23 June 1972

CPYRGHT

## Stop repression, Sakharov warns

# Physicist 'challenges' Kremlin

By Charlotte Saikowski
*Staff correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor*

A prominent Soviet scientist has expressed alarm over what he sees as the growing trend of political and religious repression in this country.

With a sense of deep urgency, Andrei D. Sakharov, the eminent nuclear physicist and dissident intellectual, has renewed his long-standing plea for a thorough democratization of Soviet society, which he terms "infected with apathy, hypocrisy, narrow-minded egoism, and hidden cruelty."

Dr. Sakharov has asked Leonid I. Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders to engage in a dialogue on a wide-ranging program of reform to liberalize virtually every facet of Soviet life. These would spell greater political and economic freedom at home and more flexible policies abroad, especially with respect to China.

### Emphasis on freedom

He urges that the Soviet Union announce it will never be the first to use weapons of mass destruction and allow on-site inspection. He also calls for creation of an international council of experts to consider questions of peace, disarmament, economic aid, human rights, and environment.

"It seems to me now, to a greater degree than before," declares the vigorous civil-rights advocate in his first major statement since 1970, "that the single true guarantee of the preservation of human values in the chaos of uncontrollable change and tragic shock is the freedom of the convictions of man, his moral striving for good."

Dr. Sakharov's appeal and proposals, many of which are not new, are contained in a lengthy memorandum of March 5, 1971, which he sent to Mr. Brezhnev for consideration. They are amplified in an afterword to the memorandum dated June, 1972.

Copies of both documents now have been made available to Western correspondents here. Dr. Sakharov states in the afterword that the memorandum "has remained without answer and I do not consider it my right to further postpone its publication."

### Drunkenness deplored

Publication would take place only in the West, of course, or in underground form here. The 51-year-old physicist has consistently challenged the Soviet leadership, and although he advocates the evolution and not the overthrow of socialism, his views are heretical from the Kremlin's standpoint.

The majority of party and government bureaucrats, he charges in his latest incisive indictment of Soviet society, cling to "open and secret privileges" and are indifferent to violations of human rights. Drunkenness has become "a national calamity." Education and health care are in a "deplorable state."

No fundamental changes in the system have taken place since Stalin's time, writes Professor Sakharov in the afterword, adding:

"With hurt and alarm I am forced to note, in the wake of a largely illusory liberalism, the growth of restrictions on ideological freedom, of striving to suppress government-controlled information, of persecution for political and ideological reasons, of an

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 COPYRGHT

intentional exacerbation of nationality problems."

## Proposals aired

These trends, he says, have gained momentum in the past 15 months, with a wave of political arrests, use of psychiatry for political purposes, and new instances of religious persecution, particularly in the Baltic states.

Written in dry outline form, the detailed memorandum touches all aspects of Soviet activity — political, economic, legal, environmental, medical — and is a kind of Sakharovian version of a state five-year plan.

Many of the proposals have been aired by Dr. Sakharov over recent years, including amnesty for political prisoners, restoration of the rights of exiled peoples, freedom of information, further economic reform, elimination of the system of single-slate elections, and removal of internal passport regulations.

Among the new proposals is one for an expansion of the private sector of agriculture, with more land and equipment allotted for garden plots. The scientist would also broaden opportunities for private initiative in the service sector, medical services, and petty trade — ideas which bring to mind the NEP reforms of Lenin's time.

On the sensitive question of nationalism, Dr. Sakharov proposes passage of a law to guarantee any Soviet republic the right of secession. He believes, rightly or wrongly, that any movements now simmering for secession would weaken with further democratization of the U.S.S.R.

Several times the noted academician stresses the debilitating effect on Soviet life of the "system of privileges" in work, education, and consumption under which the political and administrative hierarchy functions. He advocates these be done away with.

Dr. Sakharov, who helped develop the Soviet hydrogen bomb, is especially concerned about militarization of the Soviet economy. He singles out the problem of limiting the arms race and notes the inadequate study given to the military-industrial complex in the Soviet Union and other Communist nations.

A concentration of resources on internal problems, he asserts, would make it possible to overcome the Soviet nation's backwardness vis-à-vis the West and ensure its security from possible troubles with China.

## World pact urged

Taking note of the recent arms-control agreements, Dr. Sakharov expresses hope they "have not only a symbolic meaning but will also lead to a real drop in the arms race and to further steps which will soften the political climate in a world worn out with suffering."

With respect to his proposed council of experts, which could be set up under United Nations auspices, Dr. Sakharov also calls for an international pact that would bind national governments to examine the council's recommendations.

Professor Sakharov became widely known in the West with the publication there in 1968 of a long essay calling for "convergence" of the Soviet Union and the United States and touching on such questions as nuclear war, pollution, and hunger.

He now reaffirms that rapprochement and changes in both Communist and capitalist societies are needed to avert the dangers of the atomic age.

But his writings since 1968 seem to be concerned more with conditions in this country, and the latest documents carry a greater sense of urgency, perhaps because the timetable which he set in 1968 for democratic evolution of Soviet society is so far from realization (and he admits his prognoses have become "more reserved").

## Intriguing question

The intriguing question, and one impossible to answer, is the extent to which Dr. Sakharov's views are shared by the Soviet intelligentsia.

Only a small handful of other intellectuals have joined with him in his struggle for political liberties (he is cofounder of the unofficial Committee on Human Rights), but certainly many would welcome the more efficient and humane society which he espouses.

Dr. Sakharov also calls on foreign leaders for "active help" in the struggle for human rights, but does not suggest what form such help might take.

A quiet man, Dr. Sakharov has taken great care to operate in a strictly legal manner and without association with Western journalists, to whom he remains an obscure figure.

Although the physicist's professional responsibilities have been curtailed, he remains a member of the prestigious Academy of Sciences.

Earlier this year authorities prevented him from attending a supposedly "open" trial of a political dissident, but he generally has been left alone, presumably because of his high standing in the scientific community.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

L'EXPRESS, Paris
7-14 August 1972

CPYRGHT

# U.R.S.S. UNE SC[illegible]
# EN DANGER DE MUR[illegible]

N6 : Eric, fils de Jean-Pie[illegible]
Vre 30 ans [illegible]

par Andréi SAKHAROV

**Père de la bombe H russe, membre de l'Académie des sciences d'U.R.S.S., cofondateur d'un comité officieux pour la défense des droits de l'homme, le Pr Andréi Sakharov est, à 51 ans, le plus illustre des critiques du régime soviétique. Sa notoriété l'a laissé, jusqu'à présent, à l'abri des représailles. Déjà « fiché » en 1968 à la suite de la diffusion clandestine d'un manuscrit intitulé « Réflexions sur le progrès, la coexistence pacifique et la liberté individuelle » (L'Express du 26 août 1968), M. Sakharov adressait à M. Leonid Brejnev, le 5 mars 1971, un « mémoire » proposant un vaste programme de réformes. « On ne m'a jamais répondu, dit-il. Je n'ai vu d'autre recours que de le rendre public. En y joignant un post-scriptum. » Lequel vient de nous parvenir, daté de juin 1972. Le voici.**

Une guerre thermonucléaire serait un crime. Les essais d'armes thermonucléaires dans l'atmosphère en sont un. L'ayant compris, j'ai entrepris, voilà dix ou douze ans, l'action que je poursuis encore. Depuis lors, j'ai passé beaucoup de mes idées au crible. Particulièrement en 1968, année dont je consacrai les premiers mois à travailler à mes « Réflexions sur le progrès », et dont les derniers mois retentirent pour nous tous du grondement des tanks dans Prague l'irréductible.

## *La liberté pour l'homme de choisir ses idées*

Autant qu'alors, je salue les progrès sociaux, culturels, économiques, accomplis chez nous depuis un demi-siècle. Sachant, néanmoins, que bien d'autres pays en ont fait autant, et qu'il y faut voir un reflet du progrès mondial. Autant qu'alors, je pense que l'on ne peut surmonter les contradictions et les périls tragiques de notre ère qu'en rapprochant et en modifiant ensemble les structures capitalistes et socialistes.

Chez les nations capitalistes, ce processus doit s'accompagner d'un renforcement de la protection des travailleurs, et d'un affaiblissement du militarisme et de son influence politique. Chez les nations socialistes, il est essentiel de restreindre l'économie militariste et l'idéologie messianique. Quant aux aspects les plus extrêmes du centralisme et du monopole bureaucratique du Parti, il est vital de les réduire, autant dans le domaine économique que dans celui de l'idéologie et de la culture.

Comme alors, la démocratisation de la société, le développement de l'information publique, la légalité, l'exercice des droits essentiels de l'homme me paraissent d'une importance décisive. Comme alors, j'espère que le progrès matériel poussera la société à évoluer en ce sens, bien qu'aujourd'hui je réserve davantage mon pronostic.

Il m'apparaît, plus encore qu'auparavant, que pour préserver les valeurs humaines en dépit du chaos et du choc des transformations qui échappent à notre contrôle, il n'est qu'une seule garantie véritable : la liberté pour l'homme de choisir ses idées et de s'efforcer au bien.

## *L'ivrognerie prend allure de calamité nationale*

Notre société est malade d'apathie, d'hypocrisie, d'égoïsme à courte vue, de cruauté cachée. La plus grande partie de sa couche supérieure — l'appareil administratif du Parti et du gouvernement, la fraction la plus favorisée de l'intelligentsia — s'accroche obstinément à ses privilèges, secrets ou non, et se montre profondément indifférente aux violations des droits de l'homme, aux besoins de progrès, à la sécurité de l'humanité future. D'autres, au plus profond de leur âme, s'en préoccupent. Mais ils ne peuvent se permettre la moindre pensée libre, et ne peuvent que se torturer l'esprit. L'ivrognerie prend allure de calamité nationale.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

C'est un des symptômes de la dégradation morale d'une société qui sombre de plus en plus dans l'alcoolisme chronique.

Pour que le pays retrouve son âme, il faut éliminer ces conditions qui poussent les gens à l'hypocrisie et au conformisme, qui créent chez eux l'insatisfaction, le désenchantement, l'impuissance. Il faut assurer à chacun, dans les faits et non dans les mots, des chances égales de travail, d'éducation, de culture. Il faut éliminer le système des privilèges dans tous les secteurs de la consommation. Une liberté idéologique totale est essentielle, autant qu'une réforme radicale de l'éducation et que l'abolition de la persécution idéologique sous toutes ses formes. Là-dessus reposent beaucoup des propositions offertes dans mon mémoire.

Celui-ci pose, notamment, un problème : l'amélioration de la condition matérielle, et de l'indépendance, des deux groupes les plus nombreux et les plus importants de l'intelligentsia : les enseignants et les médecins. La condition déplorable de l'éducation et de la santé publiques est soigneusement dissimulée aux étrangers. Mais elle ne peut rester cachée à ceux qui veulent voir. La gratuité de l'hôpital et de l'école n'est qu'une illusion économique dans une société où le gouvernement s'approprie, et répartit, tous les surplus acquis.

La santé et l'éducation reflètent, de façon particulièrement pernicieuse, la structure hiérarchique de nos classes sociales et le système des privilèges. Au peuple ne s'ouvrent que des hôpitaux délabrés, des écoles où le professeur, pauvre et opprimé lui-même, dispense un enseignement entaché d'hypocrisie conventionnelle, répandant parmi la génération montante l'esprit d'indifférence aux valeurs artistiques, scientifiques et morales.

Pour guérir cette société, il faut, tout spécialement, mettre un terme aux persécutions politiques sous leurs formes judiciaires, psychiatriques, et toutes celles que favorisent une bureaucratie bigote et l'intervention d'un gouvernement totalitaire dans la vie des citoyens : privation d'emploi, exclusion de l'enseignement supérieur, refus de permis de résidence, freinage à l'avancement, etc.

Les milieux dirigeants n'ont pas répondu à la renaissance morale du peuple et de l'intelligentsia, qui s'était amorcée une fois freinées les manifestations les plus extrêmes du terrorisme aveugle de Staline. Aucune mutation fondamentale n'a touché les structures de base, sociales et idéologiques, de l'U.R.S.S. L'inquiétude et le chagrin me poussent au contraire à souligner — dans le sillage de cette « libéralisation » illusoire — l'effort accru, qui restreint la liberté des idées et de l'information, qui multiplie les persécutions politiques et idéologiques, qui exacerbe, tout exprès, les problèmes des minorités nationales. Les quinze mois écoulés depuis que j'ai soumis mon « mémoire » ont apporté des preuves, nouvelles et inquiétantes, de l'aggravation de ces courants.

## *Nous avons aussi notre complexe militaro-industriel*

Une vague d'arrestations politiques dans les premiers mois de 1972 apparaît particulièrement alarmante. Beaucoup ont eu lieu en Ukraine. D'autres à Moscou, à Leningrad et ailleurs. L'usage que l'on fait de la psychiatrie à des fins politiques est absolument intolérable, et comporte pour la société des conséquences extraordinairement dangereuses. Protestations et déclarations abondent à ce sujet. Mais Piotr Grigorenko, Vladimir Gershuni et bien d'autres sont toujours enfermés dans des cliniques-prisons. De Victor Feinberg et de Vladimir Borisov, on ne sait rien (1). Il est d'autres cas, récents, tel le poète Luponos, en Ukraine.

La persécution, l'écrasement de la religion se poursuivent depuis des décennies, avec une cruauté opiniâtre. C'est là une atteinte aux droits de l'homme particulièrement lourde de conséquences. La liberté de religion est partie intégrante de la liberté intellectuelle en général. Les derniers mois en ont vu, malheureusement, de nouvelles violations. Notamment dans les Républiques baltes et ailleurs.

Je ne m'attarderai pas, dans ce post-scriptum, sur d'importants problèmes abordés dans le « mémoire » et dans d'autres documents que j'ai publiés — sous forme de lettres ouvertes à des membres du Présidium du Soviet suprême — traitant de la liberté d'émigration, ou de la discrimination à l'encontre des Tatars de Crimée, évoquée dans une lettre au ministre de l'Intérieur. Je ne m'appesantirai pas non plus sur la plupart des problèmes internationaux dont le « mémoire » faisait état. Je me contenterai de parler ici de la course aux armements.

La militarisation de l'économie joue profondément sur la politique, intérieure et étrangère, viole la démocratie, la loi, le droit à l'information, et menace la paix. On a étudié de près l'influence du complexe militaro-industriel sur la politique américaine. Son rôle en U.R.S.S. et dans d'autres pays socialistes est moins connu.

## *Une voix venue du monde socialiste*

Il faut pourtant souligner — c'est essentiel — que le pourcentage des dépenses militaires par rapport au revenu national n'est nulle part aussi élevé qu'en U.R.S.S. : plus de 40 %.

Quand la méfiance règne, le problème du contrôle prend un relief particulier. J'écris cela peu après la signature d'accords importants sur la limitation des missiles antimissiles et des fusées stratégiques. On voudrait croire que les chefs politiques et les dirigeants des complexes militaro-industriels, en U.R.S.S. et aux Etats-Unis, se sentent responsables devant l'humanité. On voudrait croire que ces accords n'ont pas seulement valeur symbolique, mais qu'ils freineront vraiment la course aux armements et conduiront à d'autres mesures qui adouciraient le climat politique d'un monde épuisé par la souffrance.

J'en appelle non seulement à mes lecteurs soviétiques, mais aussi à ceux qui me lisent à l'étranger, dans l'espoir qu'ils contribueront activement à cette lutte pour les droits de l'homme. J'espère aussi que ma voix, venue du monde socialiste, aidera à mieux tirer la leçon de l'Histoire de ces dernières décennies.

(1) Par lettre ouverte du 1er août à M. Boris Petrovsky, ministre de la Santé, le Pr Sakharov a annoncé que MM. Feinberg et Borisov « étaient au seuil de la mort »

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

à l'hôpital psychiatrique de Leningrad où ils sont enfermés depuis plus de trois ans. Le critique d'art Victor Feinberg a été arrêté, le 25 août 1968, pour avoir manifesté sur la place Rouge contre l'invasion de la Tchécoslovaquie. L'ingénieur Vladimir Borisov avait signé une pétition aux Nations unies protestant contre les arrestations politiques en U.R.S.S. Privés de livres, empêchés d'écrire, ils ont fait plusieurs grèves de la faim. Selon le Pr Sakharov, une commission médicale, en avril, les a reconnus sains d'esprit. Une décision judiciaire les a maintenus à l'hôpital.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

NEW YORK TIMES
18 August 1972

CPYRGHT

# The Sakharov Memorandum

Andrei D. Sakharov

I consider it imperative to request that the following suggestions be considered by the competent authorities.

• In my view, the time was ripe long ago for dealing with the question of a general amnesty to political prisoners; including persons convicted by reason of their religion, persons confined to psychiatric institutions, persons convicted of attempting to cross the border, political prisoners given additional sentences for attempting to escape from a camp, or of spreading propaganda in a camp. It is essential to take steps to insure extensive, factual publicity of the proceedings in all trials, especially those of a political nature.

I consider psychiatric punishment for reasons of a political, ideological or religious nature intolerable. It is essential to pass a law defending the rights of persons subjected to forced psychiatric hospitalization; also, to adopt resolutions and the necessary legislative refinements for the defense of the rights of persons presumed to be mentally disturbed in connection with prosecutions on political charges.

• Concerning open public disclosure, free exchange of information and freedom of conviction, it is essential that a draft law concerning the press and other means of mass communication be submitted for consideration by the general public.

• Concerning nationality problems and the problem of departure from our country, it is essential to pass resolutions and laws fully restoring the rights of the peoples resettled under Stalin and to pass laws ensuring the free and unimpeded exercise by citizens of their right to leave the country and to return to it freely.

• Concerning international problems, it is essential to take the initiative and announce (or confirm—unilaterally, to start with) our refusal to be the first to employ weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical, bacteriological or incendiary). It is essential to permit inspection teams on our territory for effective control of disarmament.

It is essential to alter our political position in the Middle East and in Vietnam, vigorously striving—through the United Nations and diplomatic channels—for the earliest possible peaceful settlement under conditions of a compromise.

•

Is is essential to work out a clear and consistent program for further democratization and liberalization and to take a number of steps which are top priority and not to be postponed. This must be done in the interest of economic and technological progress; in the interest of gradually overcoming our backwardness in comparison with the advanced capitalist countries and our isolation from them; in the interest of the well-being of wide sections of the population; in the interest of the internal stability and the external security of our country. The development of our country is proceeding under conditions of considerable difficulties in our relations with China. We are faced with serious internal problems in the areas of economics and the well-being of the population, economic and technological progress, culture and ideology.

The following problems should be noted: aggravation of the nationality problem; complications in relations between the party-government apparatus and the intelligentsia, and in their relations with the basic mass of workers who find themselves in a relatively poorer position as far as living standards and economic situation go and in relation to job promotion and cultural growth, and who experience in a number of cases a feeling of disenchantment with "big talk" and the privileged group of "bosses," a group which for the most part often includes the intelligentsia in the eyes of the more backward strata of workers because of their traditional preju-

The state sets as its fundamental goal the protection and the guarantee of the basic rights of its citizens. The defense of the rights of man is the highest of all goals. All acts of governmental institutions are wholly based on laws which are stable and known to the citizenry. Observance of the laws is obligatory for all citizens, institutions and organizations.

Open publicity facilitates public control of the legality, equity and effectiveness of the system as a whole, favors the scientific democratic character of the administrative system, and contributes to the progress, well-being and security of the country.

The nation's basic energy is directed toward harmonious internal development with effective utilization of labor and natural resources. This is the foundation of its strength and prosperity.

Messianism is foreign to this society, as are delusions about the uniqueness and exclusive virtues of its own system and the negation of the system of others.

The basic problem in foreign policy is that of relations with China. While offering the Chinese people the option of economic, technical and cultural aid, fraternal cooperation and joint movement along the democratic path—always keeping open the possibility for the development of relations in that direction—it is essential at the same time to show special concern for insuring the security of our country, to avoid all other possible foreign and domestic entanglements, and to carry out our own plans for the development of Siberia, taking the above-mentioned factor into account.

It is essential to strive for non-intervention in the internal affairs of other Socialist states and for mutual economic assistance.

It is essential to take the initiative in creating (within the framework of the U.N.?) a new international consultative agency—an international council of experts on problems of peace, disarmament, economic aid to needy countries, on the defense of the rights

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

of man, and on the protection of the natural environment—staffed by highly qualified and disinterested persons.

In the area of personnel cadres and administration, it is essential to make decisions requiring greater public disclosure on the work of governmental agencies at all levels, within the limits allowed by the national interest. Matters of special importance include review of the tradition of dealing with problems of personnel policy behind closed doors; extension of open and effective public verification of the selection of cadres and extension of the electivity and actual removal from office in cases of incompetence of managers at all levels. I also have in mind the usual demand in democratic programs for the elimination of the system of elections where the number of candidates does not exceed the number of posts, i.e., the elimination of "elections without choice."

Measures should be taken to facilitate an expansion of agricultural production on the personal plots of kolkhoz farmers, workers on sovkhozes, and individual peasants; revision of the tax policy, expansion of the tracts of land in this sector, revision of the system for provision to this sector of modern and specially designed agricultural equipment and fertilizers.

Finally, we should expand the possibilities and advantages for private initiative in the sphere of services, health care, retail trade and education.

The question of the gradual abolition of the passport system must be examined, since it is a great hindrance to the development of the country's productive forces and a violation of the rights of citizens—especially the inhabitants of rural areas.

●

In the sphere of information exchange, culture, science, and freedom of convictions, it is essential to encourage freedom of convictions, the spirit of inquiry, and concern for effectiveness. It is essential to discontinue the jamming of foreign radio transmissions, expand imports of foreign literature, join the international system for protecting authors' copyrights, and facilitate international tourism—in order to overcome the isolation which is ruinous to our development.

It is essential to make decisions ensuring the actual separation of church from state, and actual (*i.e.*, guaranteed juridically, materially, and administratively) freedom of conscience and worship.

It is essential to take another look at those aspects of the relations between the governmental-party apparatus and art, literature, the theater, and educational agencies, which act to the detriment of the development of culture in our country.

●

In the social sphere, it is essential to examine the question of the feasibility of abolishing capital punishment.

It is essential to consider the feasibility of establishing a public watchdog agency which would have the goal of ruling out the possibility of the use of physical force (beating, exposure to hunger and cold) on persons detained, arrested, under investigation, or convicted.

There must be radical improvement in the quality of education.

More extensive measures must be taken in combating alcoholism.

It is essential to step up measures in the fight against noise and the poisoning of the air and water; in the fight against erosion, the salination of the soil, and its poisoning by chemicals.

Concerning reform of the system of health care we must: expand the network of polyclinics and hospitals requiring payment of fees; increase the role of physicians, registered nurses, and practical nurses in private practice; increase the wages of medical workers at all levels; reform the pharmaceutical industry; increase the general availability of modern medication and remedies; introduction of closed-circuit X-ray television installations.

In the sphere of law it is essential to eliminate overt and covert forms of discrimination for one's convictions and for characteristics of nationality.

It is essential to consider the question of the ratification, by the Supreme Soviet U.S.S.R., of the Covenant on Human Rights adopted by the 21st Session of the U.N. General Assembly, and of adhering to the optional protocol to that declaration.

In the sphere of relations with national republics, our country has proclaimed the right of nations to self-determination, up to and including secession.

The right of the union republics to secede is proclaimed by the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. In fact, the mere discussion of such questions often provokes prosecution. In my opinion, a juridical analysis of the problem and the passing of a law guaranteeing the right to secede would have great domestic and international significance as a confirmation of the antiimperialist and antichauvinist nature of our policy. It seems quite plain that none of the secessionist tendencies in any republic of the U.S.S.R. has a mass character and that they will undoubtedly weaken in time, as a result of the further democratization of the U.S.S.R. On the other hand, it is quite certain that any republic which, for whatever reasons, secedes from the U.S.S.R. by peaceful constitutional means will fully preserve its ties with the socialist commonwealth of nations. In such a case, the economic interests and defense capacity of the socialist camp would not suffer, since the cooperation of socialist nations is of a very complete and all-ambracing character and will undoubtedly be intensified even further under conditions of mutual nonintervention by the socialist states in each others internal affairs. For these reasons, consideration of this question does not strike me as hazardous.

If, at one point or another, the presentation of this memorandum is unnecessarily categorical in character, it is because of the demands of brevity.

The problems facing our country are intimately related to certain aspects of the worldwide crisis of the 20th century: the crisis in international security, the loss of stability in social development, the ideological dead-end and disenchantment with the ideals of the recent past, nationalism, the danger of dehumanization. By virtue of our country's special position in the world, a constructive solution of our problems—a solution at once cautious, flexible, and decisive—would be of great significance for all mankind.

Signature, A. SAKHAROV
5 March, 1971

●

This "memorandum" was sent to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on March 5, 1971. It has remained unanswered. I do not consider it my right to postpone its publication. This postscript is written in June 1972.

As before I cannot help but value the great salutary changes (social, cultural, economic), which have taken place in our country over the last fifty years, taking into account, however, the fact that similar changes have taken place

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 COPYRGHT

in many countries, and that they reflect a development of worldwide progress.

Our society is infected with apathy, hypocrisy, narrow-minded egotism, hiddden cruelty. The majority of the representatives of its highest stratum —the party and government administrative apparatus, the most successful strata of the intelligentsia—hang on tenaciously to their open and secret privileges and are deeply indifferent to violations of human rights, to the interests of progress, to the security of future mankind. Others, in the depths of their souls, are concerned, but cannot allow themselves the slightest free thinking and are doomed to tortuous conflict within themselves.

For the spiritual recovery of the country those conditions must be eliminated which push people toward hypocrisy and accommodation, which create in them a feeling of helplessness, dissatisfaction and disenchantment. Complete ideological freedom is essential, a complete end to all forms of persecution for convictions.

With hurt and alarm I am forced to note, in the wake of illusory liberalism, the growth of restrictions on ideological freedom, of striving to suppress information not controlled by the government, of persecution for political and ideological reasons of an exacerbation of national problems. problems.

The wave of political arrests in the first months of 1972 are particularly alarming. In the Ukraine numerous arrests took place. Arrests took place as well in Moscow, in Leningrad and in other regions of the country. Public attention in those months was drawn to the trials of Bukovsky in Moscow, Strokatova in Odessa, and others.

The use of psychiatry for political purposes is extraordinarily dangerous in its consequences for society and completely intolerable. Numerous protests and statements on this question are known.

The persecution and destruction of religion has been conducted with persistence and cruelty over the course of decades—doubtless one of the most serious in its consequences for the violations of human rights in our country.

I write this postscript soon after the signing of important agreements on the limitation of A.B.M. and strategic rockets. One wants to believe in a feeling of responsibility before mankind on the part of the political rulers and officials of the military-industrial complexes of the United States and the U.S.S.R. One wants to believe that these agreements have not only a symbolic meaning, but will also lead to a real lessening in the arms race and to further steps which will soften the political climate in a world worn out with suffering.

In conclusion I think it essential to stress the importance which I attach to the proposal on organization of an international consultative organ of the international council of experts with the right to make recommendations whose consideration would be obligatory for the national governments. I consider that proposal to be realistic, on condition that it receive the broad international support which I am requesting.

I appeal not only to Soviet, but also to foreign readers, hoping for their active help in the struggle for human rights. I hope also that my voice from "inside" the socialist world will in some measure improve comprehension of the historical experience of the last few decades.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
CPYRGHT

WASHINGTON POST,
28 June 1972

*KGB Harasses, Then Arrests Russian Liberal*

# The Yakir Case: Dissent vs. Authority

By Anthony Astrachan

PYOTR IONAVICH YAKIR, for years one of the best-known members of the tiny Moscow dissident community, used to say that the chief prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Secret Police had warned him three times that only respect for the memory of his father had kept them from arresting him for anti-Soviet activity.

"They did not explain," Yakir wrote last year in an open letter to the Presidium of the 24th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, "why anti-Stalinism is equated with anti-Sovietism. Until now the difference between these things has been clear to me, and I tried with all my strength to underline this difference—prompted precisely by respect for my father's memory."

Yakir's father was Army Commander Iona Yakir, whom Stalin executed in 1937 as part of his purge of Red Army leaders. Judging by photographs and the recollections of those who knew him, Iona Yakir was the model revolutionary portrayed in Soviet propaganda of that era—young, brisk but warm, with the eyes of an idealist and the hands of a practical man.

The son of a Jewish pharmacist in Kishinev, the elder Yakir organized a Bolshevik guerrilla band in the Ukraine when the revolution broke out. He was then 21. Three years later he was commanding an ar..y group in the Bolsheviks' war against the Poles. In 1926, he became commander of the important Ukrainian military district. When Stalin had him killed at the age of 41, Yakir was genuinely popular in the Ukraine—where streets are named after him today in Kharkov and Kiev—and was the only professional soldier on the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the true focus of power in the Soviet Union.

Pyotr Yakir, then 14, and his mother went into prison camps when his father was executed, as did the families of many purge victims. She was later "liquidated": He stayed in camp for 17 years. That record, as well as his father's memory, made foreign correspondents in Moscow believe that the authorities, although they harassed him, would be reluctant to arrest Yakir despite his frequent protests against injustice in the Soviet Union—and despite his open activity in keeping the world informed of those injustices.

The authorities have overcome their reluctance. On June 21, the KGB arrested Yakir, now 49, on charges under Article 70 of the Russian Republic Criminal Code, which prohibits "agitation or propaganda carried out with the purpose of subverting or weakening the Soviet regime or in order to commit particularly dangerous crimes against the state [or] the dissemination for the said purposes of slanderous inventions defamatory to the Soviet political and social system."

The penalties are up to seven years in prison and up to five years' exile. "Exile" in this sense has meant exile from the place of residence since the Stalin era, but Soviet sources have been hinting that the Kremlin might revive exile to foreign lands as a treatment for dissenters.

Leon Trotsky was the last Soviet oppositionist to be physically deported against his will, but a number of dissidents have recently been allowed to leave under cover of the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel. The poet Iosif Brodsky was recently told to emigrate or expect a prison sentence. Yakir told an American caller a few days before his arrest that he had received an invitation to Israel from people he did not know, but that he would never use it.

The foreign observer is often bewildered that the Soviet authorities should go to such lengths to repress dissenters who are unlikely ever to change the Soviet system—because they are so few, so disunited, so atypical of the Soviet people. But they keep the possibility of change alive, and that alone seems to be more than the Soviet leaders can stand.

Yakir saw his prime function as spreading information. In 1970, he and other dissidents gathered in the Moscow woods so CBS correspondent William Cole could film them. He told Cole, "Under Stalin, there was always an Iron Curtain and no one knew what was going on here. Millions of people were destroyed and nobody knew anything about it. Now we try to publicize every arrest, every dismissal. We see in this our most important role—that of informing people about what is going on in our country and about those illegal acts."

Yakir knew that when he and his friends told Western correspondents about events like the forcible confinement of the biologist Zhores Medvedev in a psychiatric clinic, their stories would soon be broadcast back to the Soviet Union in Russian by Radio Liberty, The Voice of America and the BBC. He believed that by making a return to Stalinist secrecy impossible, he was helping to make a return to Stalinist terror impossible.

Yakir's letter to the Party Congress, which was not widely reported in the West, challenged the leadership more directly.

"For the last few years a dangerous tendency toward the rebirth of Stalinist methods of government has become apparent, he wrote, "and a tendency toward the rehabilitation of Stalin himself—one of the biggest criminals of the 20th century . . ."

Yakir claimed that this alarmed "a huge, if not overwhelming part of our creative, scientific and technical intelligentsia." He said he had written letters to party and government offices in the previous five years expressing loyal criticisms, which the government should have answered by showing which criticisms were just and which unjust.

The only answers that came, Yakir said, were "at the best silence, and at the worst, judicial and extra-judicial repression," which he called "akin to the Stalinist anti-democratic style." He cited imprisonment of political dissenters, the confinement of others in psychiatric hospitals, demands for public confessions, demotions and losses of jobs.

"To answer criticism with persecution—whose method is this? he asked. "Is this the way to prove one's case to fellow citizens and the world? . . . Who would think of writing to the United Nations, or appealing to world public opinion, if his own leadership gave him a convincing answer to serious questions bothering serious people?"

The Kremlin's ultimate answer to such criticism was Yakir's arrest. Since January, the authorities have been trying to suppress the underground chronicle of current events, and they may have thought Yakir was its "editor," though it has never been proven. Perhaps they blamed him for the recent samizdat (self-publishing) leaflet charging the Soviet leaders with economic sins. But in the past, Yakir has signed his names to the specific protests he made. This one was anonymous.

Many western observers believe that increasing repression may be the price that party leader Brezhnev had to pay to get hard-liners to go along with his plans to meet President Nixon at the summit despite Mr. Nixon's escalation of the war in Vietnam.

Yakir might smile at the thought that he could be the target of such reasons of state. He is a burly figure whose bravery was never questioned by either foreign or Muscovite acquaintances. He has the high specific gravity that comes from long years of "sitting," as Russians call life in prison, which showed through his explosive thought processes, his frustration at being barred from his profession as a historian, his hard drinking and his frequent hospitalization for bodily ills. But one day on a remote Moscow streetcorner, when he started to apologize for dragging me out of my way to meet someone who had not shown up, I saw an overwhelming resemblance beteen Yakir and Sholom Aleichem's "Tevye the Milkman," resilient in survival despite his apotheosis in "Fiddler on the Roof," smiling at the thought that the Tsar might be readying a thunderbolt for him in Anatevka.

His arrest shows there is nothing to smile about. The KGB has won the inheritance it claimed. A few years ago, one of its interrogators asked Yakir: "Do you think that you are your father's heir? No. We are his heirs."

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
26 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# Soviets tighten disciplining of dissidents

## *Even as hard line toward West softens*

**By Paul Wohl**
*Written for The Christian Science Monitor*

Softening of Soviet policy toward the West is going hand in hand in tightening of discipline in the U.S.S.R.

Pravda on June 18 had nothing but scorn for presidential adviser Henry A. Kissinger's one-time hope that "a democracy of the Western type" might take root in the Soviet Union. The idea of an ultimate convergence of the two antagonistic economic and social systems is being sharply rejected.

Secret police have fanned out to search and arrest suspected dissidents, members of Prof. Andrei D. Sakharov's small civil-rights committee, non-Russian nationalists, and even the embarrassing ultra-Stalinist hard-liners.

### Delinquency added

Some dissidents who hitherto had enjoyed protection because of family connections or special qualifications now also are being handled roughly.

On June 20, state security agents searched the apartment of historian Pyotr Yakir, a prominent member of the civil-rights committee. Previously the outspoken Mr. Yakir had enjoyed virtual immunity because of his famous father, Gen. Yona Yakir, a tragic victim of Stalin's great purge. This time Pyotr Yakir was arrested.

The pretext for the continuous investigation of suspects is always "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda," but delinquency also is being mentioned as a reason for greater police "vigilance."

Minister of the Interior Nikolai A. Shchelokov announced tougher measures against criminality and hooliganism in the April issue of the Central Committee's bi-weekly Partinaya Zhizn (Party Life). Demonstrators invariably are referred to as hooligans in official terminology.

Many Western broadcasts are jammed. Tourist luggage and, even more, the luggage of Soviets returning from missions, is being intensely searched for forbidden publications.

Evangelic Baptists and the smaller churches suffer greater harassment than in former years. After the admission that "believers" were discovered in the Army, Maj. Gen. E. Dvoryansky in "Kommunist of the Armed Forces" of February let go with a long article entitled: "Atheist propaganda must take the offensive."

Even the Roman Catholic Church has been sharply retrenched in Catholic Lithuania and the Ukraine, although Moscow for a while treated the Roman clergy with velvet gloves because of the Vatican's influence in Western Europe.

Now that the Vatican has supported the idea of a European security conference and general policy at home has toughened, such diplomatic considerations have been discarded.

### New approach

A movement is on to organize and supervise leisure time and to cram more and more Marxism-Leninism down people's throats, combined with refutations and denunciations of Western ideologies.

Literature and the arts are being handled more strictly than in years. But here there is a new approach. Hopeless dissidents, who the Soviets feel can neither be reformed nor wholly silenced, are being allowed or prompted to leave for the West.

This recently happened to mathematician and poet Alexander Yesenin-Volpin, the son of the famous Russian poet, Sergei Yesenin, who committed suicide in 1925 and is said to be General Secretary Leonid I. Brezhnev's favorite poet.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

and somewhat eccentric man who has taken part in every major protest action against the regime, was repeatedly arrested and confined to lunatic asylums.

Ultimately he always was released because of the pressure of the intellectuals and of admirers of his father's poetry. Now the regime has granted an exit visa to Mr. Yesenin-Volpin, who has set up residence in Rome.

Others now in Rome are the movie director, Yury Shtein, a member of Professor Sakharov's civil-rights committee; the writer and linguist Yury Glazov, and the religious painter, Yury Titov. The much maligned Jewish poet, Joseph Brodsky, has been allowed to emigrate and is en route to the United States.

### Exit offer rejected

Nobel-Prize winner Alexander Solzhenitsyn is said to have been asked by officials of the Ministry of Culture to leave the country. But, like the late poet, Boris Pasternak, he refused, asserting that he could live and work only in Russia.

The granting of exit visas to especially inconvenient dissidents is not altogether new. In 1966 the writer Valeri Tarsis, a scurrilous and irrepressible critic of communism, was given an exit visa.

The practice of exiling inconvenient opponents or prompting them to leave was introduced by Lenin and lasted a few years under Stalin, who had Leon Trotsky removed from the country against his will.

This practice apparently also is behind the granting of exit visas to a fairly large number of Russian Jews who were particularly insistent on getting out. In the case of the Jews, concern for Western public opinion also played a part.

With some of the worst protesters out of the way, the regime may feel that the rest of the population will accept its tough Communist law-and-order course.

CPYRGHT

THE TIMES, London
13 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# KGB steps up its campaign against dissidents

By Peter Reddaway

Despite the relaxation of tensions produced by President Nixon's visit, the latest information from the Soviet Union suggests that the Government is not letting up in its campaign to suppress dissenting individuals and groups at home. The campaign has been gathering momentum since the new year, and after the President's departure seems to be moving into higher gear.

The most important political case concerns the unauthorized Moscow journal *A Chronicle of Current Events*. Begun in January, it involves alleged crimes under Article 70 of the criminal code. This article penalizes "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" and carries a maximum penalty of 12 years of prison and exile.

So far the KGB have arrested Mr Kronid Lyubarsky, the astronomer, in Moscow; Mr Vatslav Sevruk, the philosopher, in Vilnius; Mr Leonid Plyushch, a cybernetician, in Kiev; and Mr Yury Melnik in Leningrad. But dozens of searches of flats and hundreds of interrogations have been taking place in these cities, as well as in Novosibirsk and the Ukrainian town of Uman.

Mr Plyushch is a notable figure in the "Democratic Movement" having belonged to the Moscow-based Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights since its inception in 1969. This group, informally led by Mr Pyotr Yakir, the historian, recently appealed to the authorities for Mr Plyushch's release.

Soviet policy also appears to be hardening in regard to the Zionist ferment in many of the country's Jewish communities.

In Kharkhov, in the eastern Ukraine, for example, Mr Yuly Brind, a master engraver who had applied in February to leave for Israel, was sentenced on June 1 to two-and-a-half years' imprisonment for allegedly spreading "deliberate anti-Soviet fabrications". In the western Siberian city of Sverdlovsk there is the alarming case of Mr Vladimir Markman, an engineer arrested on April 29.

Mr Markman, now aged 34, did his military service in the late 1950s in the internal troops of the KGB. When on one occasion an officer addressed some antisemitic remarks to him in the presence of the regiment, Mr Markman struck him. Instantly arrested, he made it clear that at his trial he would describe in detail the atmosphere of antisemitism among the officers. The case was dropped.

Subsequently Mr Markman graduated from Sverdlovsk's Institute of the National Economy and worked as an engineer. In 1970, however, he was dismissed for signing a protest by Sverdlovsk Jews against the Jewish "hijack trial" in Leningrad.

Then, when his friend Mr Valery Kukui was sentenced last year in Sverdlovsk to three years' imprisonment, Mr Markman, a witness in the case, was so indignant about the way his pretrial evidence had been falsified in court that he initiated an action against the judges. Earlier, he had applied to leave for Israel but had been refused.

On April 3 this year the *Evening Sverdlovsk* accused Mr Markman of having links with the Zionists, who, it was asserted, had collaborated with the Nazis in the mass extermination of Jews. After Mr Markman had rebutted this article with two friends, Mr Mark Levin and Mr Leonid Zabelishensky, Mr Levin was soon conscripted and Mr Zabelishensky, like Mr Markman, arrested.

Mr Markman's arrest has provoked widespread protests. From Lithuania, for example, 20 Vilnius Jews sent a telegram to the authorities demanding "his immediate release and an end to the humiliations and hooliganism perpetrated against him and his family". A similar telegram was sent by nine other Jews from Lithuania's second city, Kaunas, and a group of Mr Markman's friends who have been allowed to emigrate addressed a strongly worded "Appeal to World Public Opinion" from Israel.

In the Ukraine, meanwhile, a different sort of political trial is in preparation. Long-standing leaders of the revival of Ukrainian national consciousness—Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Svitlychny, Yevhen Sverstyuk and Ivan Dzyuba and Miss Nadiya Svitlychna—are among those arrested.

It is now clear that the statements of a Belgian student, Mr Jaroslav Dobosch, as reported in the Kiev paper *Pravda Ukrainy* on June 3, will be used against them.

Mr Dobosch was sent to the Ukraine to contact some of them by a right-wing émigré group, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), was detained in January, and held in prison for five months. Instead of being tried, he made his statements to a press conference not attended by Western journalists and was deported from the country.

The authorities are also putting intense pressure on two of Russia's most talented authors. Mr Bulat Okudzhava, a well-known balladeer and novelist, some of whose works have appeared in the West, has steadfastly refused to "condemn his political errors" and has just been expelled from the Communist Party. In addition, his 18-year-old son has been conscripted into the Army before he could take his final school examinations.

Secondly, a friend of Mr Okudzhava's, the novelist Mr Vladimir Maksimov, is the victim of an even more intense campaign. He is on the verge of expulsion from the writers' union for persistently refusing to denounce the Western publication of his novel *The Seven Days of Creation*. This book, regarded as a masterpiece by critics, came out last year in Germany in Russian, and will appear in some eight countries in translation.

Mr Maksimov has also played a part in the "Democratic Movement". By employing the dissenter, Mr Vladimir Bukovsky, as a secretary prior to his arrest, and by speaking up strongly in his defence before his trial, Mr Maksimov revealed himself to the authorities as more than just a heterodox writer. Partly for this reason, no doubt, he is now being threatened with internment in a mental hospital.

The threat has just provoked 33 leading European cultural figures to send a telegram to Mr Brezhnev saying that they are "deeply worried about the fate of the outstanding Russian author Vladimir Maksimov". Among the signatories were Günther Grass, Iris Murdoch, Federico Fellini, Stephen Spender and Angus Wilson.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
THE TIMES, London
28 June 1972
CPYRGHT

# Russians launch biggest drive against internal dissent since death of Stalin

By Peter Reddaway

The large number of political trials and arrests now going on in the Soviet Union make it clear that the authorities have launched their biggest drive against internal dissent since the death of Stalin in 1953.

The arrest of Mr Peter Yakir last week was symptomatic, but the wider picture is clarified only by extensive information which has recently reached the West, much of it from outlying areas far from Moscow.

In Odessa, on the Black Sea, for example, the trial took place between May 14 and May 19 of Miss Nina Strokatova, a microbiologist, and Mr Oleksa Riznykiv, a Ukrainian writer. Charged with "anti-Soviet agitation and propoganda", they received sentences of four and five years respectively in strict regime labour camps.

Miss Strokatova is the wife of one of the best known Ukrainian political prisoners, Mr Svyatoslav Karavansky, who has been in prison continuously since 1944, except for a short break between 1960 and 1965.

He is a linguistics scholar and a heterodox writer on political themes. At present held in the prison at Vladimir, where he has contrived to write articles and poems, some of which have reached the West, he is due for release in 1979.

Mr Karavansky's wife has long been active in his defence, a fact which led last year to an attack on her in the Odessa paper *Banner of Communism*. The paper asserted that "despite having known for a long time of the anti-Soviet activities of her husband Karavansky she maintained contact with him by letter and by visiting him (in prison), and took no steps to influence him to cease his anti-Soviet activity, but in fact encouraged this activity by her conduct".

Soon she was dismissed from her research post at the Odessa Medical Institute and then, in December, arrested. Two searches were carried out, one at the flat to which she was moving in the Caucasian town of Nalchik, and another at the flat she was leaving in Odessa.

Shortly after this, in March, Mr Yury Shukhevych was arrested in Nalchik, evidently in connexion with Miss Strokatova's case. But Mr Shukhevych, who was imprisoned at the age of 14 in 1948 as the son of an Ukrainian underground leader and only released in 1968, has yet to stand trial.

In Leningrad Mr Yury Melnik, an astrophysicist aged 26, was sentenced on June 19 to three years in a strict-regime camp, also for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda", to which he pleaded guilty. When the police arrested him in January they found a radio teletype machine in his flat.

This is the first trial to be held in connexion with "criminal case No 24" a case which is apparently intended to suppress the unauthorized journal *The Chronicle of Current Events* and which has led to widespread arrests and interrogations. Since the case began, three issues of the *Chronicle* have appeared, striking evidence that its suppression will not be easy.

The latest, No 25, began to circulate in Moscow last Thursday, after a longer period than usual—some seven weeks—had elapsed between the date marked on it, which indicates the final time limit for the news carried, and the actual day of issue.

In Saratov, on the middle Volga, the local paper *Kommunist* has reported on measures taken against 20 people for various sorts of unauthorized literary activity.

Six of them—Mr V. Strelnikov, a factory administrator, Mr B. Yampolsky, an artist, Mr Yu. Boldyrev, a librarian, Mr V. Nulman, a teacher, Mr A. Kattse and Mr M. Belokrys, both musicians—are accused of tape-recording programmes broadcast on the BBC, the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. They are also accused of systematically reproducing and circulating *samizdat* works by Alexander Solzhenitsyn and other dissenting writers. "From their secret hiding-place dozens of anti-Soviet materials were confiscated." The paper does not clearly indicate whether or not they have yet been brought to trial.

In Sverdlovsk, an industrial city east of the Urals, a lecturer in dialectical materialism, Mr Anatoly Reshetnik, aged 35, was recently sentenced to two years in an ordinary regime camp. He had openly criticized the party committee of his technical college and also the methods used to teach Marxism.

Also in Sverdlovsk a big political trial took place from November 10 to 13 last year, as a result of which seven people were sentenced by the regional court to periods of between two and five years in strict regime camps.

An eighth defendant was forcibly committed to a mental hospital, even though an in-patient examination lasting a month in the Sverdlovsk Regional Forensic-Psychiatric Unit had found him mentally healthy. After this, however, a two-month examination in Professor D. R. Lunts's well-known section of the Serbsky Institute in Moscow reversed the decision and produced a diagnosis of schizophrenia.

The defendants were charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, and also with forming an anti-Soviet organization. The investigation of the case lasted eight months and was conducted by a KGB team under Lieutenant-Colonel P. T. Smolikov not only in Sverdlovsk, but also in Gorky, Krasnoyarsk and the Far Eastern city of Khabarovsk. The names of the defendants are not yet known.

Sverdlovsk is also the scene of a trial which is expected to start in the next few days and which has already provoked widespread opposition among Jews in the Soviet Union and abroad.

The defendant, Mr Vladimir Markman, has been charged, like Mr Reshetnik, under article 190-1 of the Criminal Code and is an engineer who earlier applied to leave for Israel. He is also a friend of Mr Valery Kukui, a Jew sentenced last year to three years under the same article.

Also imminent is the trial in Moscow of Mr Ilya Glezer, another Jew who had applied to go to Israel. Mr Glezer, a biologist, aged 35, lectured formerly at Moscow University, and is the author of a book on the morphology of the brain, published in the Soviet Union, America and East Germany.

Finally, while the authorities are imprisoning many dissenters and encouraging—though not yet forcing—others to emigrate, they continue to intern others in mental hospitals.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR
30 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# Lithuanian troubles jolt the Kremlin

By Paul Wohl

Recent events in Lithuania have hit the Soviet Union where it hurts most. They have cast doubt on the assumed loyalty of non-Russian citizens to the ideal of "a single family of peoples, monolithically united in the multinational Soviet state," as President Podgorny defined it in the latest issue of Kommunist.

Nationalist stirrings in the Soviet Union are not new. There have been the demands of Jews to emigrate and the underground writings of Ukrainians. But the Lithuanian disturbances mark the first time that non-Russian nationalists have taken to the streets of a major city to demand independence for their republic.

The demonstrations were sparked by the self-immolation of a 20-year-old student, Roman Kalanta, who set himself on fire crying "Freedom for Lithuania." The news of his action spread rapidly through his hometown of Kaunas, Lithuania's second largest city.

For two days after his funeral, on May 18, several thousand youths shouting "Freedom!" and "Freedom for Lithuania!" swept through the city hurling stones at the militia and starting fires.

On the second day strikes broke out. The big new synthetic fiber factory, the pride of Communist Lithuania, had a sit-down. Eventually the Army was called out. Several hundred rioters were arrested.

Some days later another youth burned himself to death in a town near Vilna, the capital of Lithuania.

In 1970 there were several cases of individual Lithuanians trying to break away from Soviet rule. In October, 1970, Pranas S. Brazinkas and his son successfully hijacked a plane to Turkey. On Nov. 9, 1970, Vitantas Simokaitis, a mechanic, failed in an attempt to hijack a plane to Sweden with his pregnant wife; he was sentenced to 15 years in a corrective labor camp.

The most dramatic case of all was that of the radio operator Simas Kudirka, who leaped from a Soviet trawler to a close-by U.S. Coast Guard vessel and was returned to the custody of his shipmates.

Kudirka is a famous name in Lithuania's history. In the 1870's, when Czarist oppression was at its height, a Dr. V. Kudirka published an underground journal, called Varpas, The Bell, the counterpart of the great Russian liberal Alexander Herzen's underground journal Kolokol, which also means The Bell.

In May, 1971, Simas Kudirka stood trial before the Lithuanian supreme court in Vilna. Large extracts from his defense speech reached the underground press.

Speaking in Lithuanian to Lithuanian judges (something that would not have been possible under the Czars), he said:

"I remember when I studied in Vilnius (Lithuanian for Vilna). Instead of the two prisons which were there under the Germans, there were seven under Soviet rule and they were overfilled until 1955. Already in 1960, waves of Lithuanians with their young went to concentration camps. . . . The death of Stalin saved my people from physical extermination. . . .

"Now we are destined to die a much slower death — assimilation."

When sentenced to 10 years' hard labor, Simas Kudirka was surprised. He had expected to be shot. Instead of asking for clemency, as the presiding judge had suggested to him, Kudirka cried: "All I demand is an independent Lithuania, one that is not occupied by any army and that has a free democratic system of elections."

A few months after the Kudirka trial, the priest Juzes Zdekkis also put up a spirited defense in which Lithuanian patriotism and devotion to the Roman Catholic Church blended. Other trials against priests followed. More and more restrictions were imposed on the clergy.

Economic causes have nothing to do with Lithuania's nationalist mood. Economically Lithuanians in recent years have done fairly well. Russification and the influx of Russians have been much slower there than in the other Baltic republics.

Underlying the deep anti-Russian sentiments of a large part of the Lithuanian population are two factors: the country's tragic history of repression under the Czars and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church.

After World War I Lithuania gained a short-lived independence. Then, in 1941, the country was incorporated into the U.S.S.R. Tens of thousands of anti-Communist Lithuanians immediately were deported. After

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 CPYRGHT

that came the Nazis leaving 300,000, mainly Jewish victims in their wake.

When the victorious Soviets returned, they were greeted by Lithuania's quite numerous Communists as liberators. But once in power, Russians and Lithuanian Communists started to terrorize the rest of the population. Lithuanian emigres believe that between 1944 and 1952 some 400,000 of their countrymen were killed or exiled to Siberia.

Today Lithuanian Communists and Soviet officials are deeply disturbed about the nationalist, anti-Russian mood of the population. While they have not slackened in their struggle against Roman Catholic and other religious influence, they are seeking to win over the nationalists to their cause. This may explain the unexpectedly mild verdict against Kudirka.

With preparations for the 50th anniversary of the U.S.S.R., in full swing, the recent developments in Lithuania represent a severe jolt for the Kremlin.

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS
19 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# Arrests by KGB Continue in Ukraine

By Ted Harding

The toll of victims of bureaucratic repression in the Ukraine continues to mount. Since the Central Committee decision last December 30 to put an end to the production and circulation of underground periodicals, repression in the Ukraine has been severe.

In mid-January, the KGB (secret police) arrested well over 100 Ukrainians in an attempt to silence the most militant voices of opposition. (See *Intercontinental Press*, April 10, 1972.) Show trials of some of the dissenters are scheduled to begin sometime this summer.

A new departure from the traditional Stalinist slanders of the Ukrainian opposition movement involves attempts to link that movement with China. In addition to the charge of "slandering" the Soviet state, three of the hundred or so arrested—Vyacheslav Chornovil, Evheny Sverstiuk, and Ivan Svitlichny—have also been accused of conspiring with a Belgian student tourist, Y. Dobosh, for the purpose of spreading "anti-Soviet propaganda." Dobosh was arrested around the same time as the others and charged with being an agent of an émigré nationalist organization.

The full meaning of Dobosh's arrest was revealed in an article in the Ukrainian press entitled "An Infamous Alliance" (*Radianska Ukraina*, February 26). This article documents China's developing dialogue with Ukrainian émigré nationalist organizations and states that Dobosh's "enemy activity" was indirectly financed by the Chinese; through Dobosh, it links the Ukrainian dissidents with Mao's "anti-Leninist . . . overt and malicious anti-Sovietism."

Protest in the Ukraine against the mid-January wave of repression was immediate and widespread. This protest, according to the latest reports from the Ukraine, brought on yet another repressive wave as approximately fifty persons, primarily students, were arrested in Lvov and Ivano-Frankovsk for coming to the defense of the victims of the previous arrests.

Dissident sources also report that the KGB is continuing to carry out an unusually widespread campaign of arrests, interrogations, and searches of persons suspected of active opposition.

Ivan Dzyuba, author of the book *Internationalism or Russification?*, has been arrested. Dzyuba was born into a peasant family in a village in the Donbass coal-mining region of the Ukraine in 1931, and became a prominent literary critic. He did much to encourage new trends in Ukrainian literature. In September 1965, a week or so before the arrests of Sinyavsky and Daniel, numerous arrests of young intellectuals took place in the Ukraine. On September 4 Dzyuba, together with V. Chornovil and I. Stus, staged a protest in the "Ukraina" cinema in Kiev. He also spoke at Babi Yar in 1966, calling anti-Semitism "the fruit and satellite of agelong slavery and lack of culture, the first and inevitable offspring of political despotism," and he condemned anti-Semitic campaigns. His book is an examination of the Leninist policy on nationalities and its subsequent betrayal by the Stalinist bureaucracy. His arrest comes after years of harassment by the secret police.

Nadia Svitlichna, sister of Ivan Svitlichny, a prominent literary critic and one of the best-known dissidents in the Ukraine, was arrested on May 19, according to a report in the British press. Nadia Svitlichna, who is around 30 years old, was sacked from her job as a librarian in Kiev in 1969 for signing documents pleading for greater freedom.

As part of the extended crackdown on those suspected of "anti-Soviet" activity, Dr. Vyacheslav Gluzman, a Kiev psychiatrist, has also been arrested. Gluzman is a close friend of Ukrainian author Viktor Nekrasov, who was recently interrogated by the secret police.

Leonid Plyushch, mathematician and founding member of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Civil Rights in the USSR, has been detained by the police. Plyushch was suspected of involvement in the production and distribution of uncensored *samizdat* ma-

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 CPYRGHT

terial, including the bimonthly *Chronicle of Current Events*.

Whether the arrests will deter other dissidents from continuing their activity is doubtful. Commenting on the circular effect of police repression, Valentyn Moroz declared during his trial: "Our society has entered a stage of development when repressions produce results diametrically opposed to your [the KGB's] intentions. . . . The movement has acquired the potential to produce new leaders to replace those removed by you. . . . Is it possible that you do not comprehend that you will soon be dealing with social movements of massive proportions?"

SOVIET ANALYST, London
20 July 1972

# Leninism and Nationality

CPYRGHT

The past few years have seen the emergence in the Soviet Union of dissident criticism of not merely Stalin and his acolytes, but of Lenin himself. While in the West a certain sentimentalising of the founder of the Soviet Union is fairly widespread — even in such institutions as UNESCO — the more critical-minded Russians are increasingly inclined to stress his responsibility for the whole one-party, bureaucratic obscurantist state.

More recently, even his reputation as a political strategist is being called in question. A thoughtful Soviet official, in conversation with a Western diplomat a few weeks ago, interestingly developed the view that some of Lenin's supposedly major constitutions have after all proved fallacious—particularly in the field of nationality policy.

The third self-immolation by a young Lithuanian in protest against the Soviet occupation has once again been widely reported in the Western press. Further similar information continues to come in—more recently, a report of a demonstration by students of the Tallinn Polytechnical Institute in Esthonia, which is at present undergoing police investigation. Meanwhile at least two regularly circulating underground *Samizdat* periodicals are reported in Esthonia—one of them representing an "Esthonian National Front". In the Ukraine, too, recent draconic measures seem to have stiffened, rather then weakened, the resistance. These are among the many indications that, as we have noted in previous issues Leninist nationality policy has not succeeded in reconciling the subject people.

The duration and extent of the post-war guerilla fighting in the Baltic countries, sometimes ignored or even denied in Western progressive literature, can incidentally, be documented from Soviet sources. For example, the Lithuanian Communist paper *Tiesa* (18 November, 1967) mentions guerilla groups still in action in 1952, and other descriptions of the fighting are to be found over the last decade in many other local organs, such as *Cina* (29 September, 1958, 15 January, 1962, 17 November, 1964, 2 November, 1966), and *Zvaigzne* (No. 20, 1960); and in the official *History of the Latvian SSR*, Riga, 1958, Vol. 3, page 596.

It is arguable, in fact, that Lenin's whole scheme for a federation, by which the smaller nations would supposedly gain all the national satisfaction they required, was a faulty one, and that Rosa Luxemburg's preference for a completely internationalised proletarian state would have been a better manoeuvre. For up to a point, the Leninist policy permitted a marginal continuity of national cultures and feelings. Its failure, after 50 years (or half that time in the Baltic states), may suggest that a frankly unitary and assimilationist policy could have produced better results from the Communist point of view. It is at least conceivable that the Ukraine and Byelorussia in particular could by now have been Russianised. In fact, Lenin's notion of using national feelings against his enemies may only have paid off here and there, and in the short run. In this connection one may note a similar area in which Lenin's thought was presented as of world strategical brilliance—the revolutionising of China as a weapon against the rear of the West. This too, the Soviet official mentioned above ironically noted, does not seem to be turning out as expected. (Nor, to a lesser degree, do similar calculations about Egypt seem, as we go to press, to be giving the required results).

In fact a whole set of policies going back over half a century, and basic to the whole Soviet conception of the world are proving faulty, and the results of long miscalculation are coming home to roost.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

NEUE ZUERCHER ZEITUNG, Zurich
2 April 1972

## NATIONALISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Once again Moscow is preparing for larger-scale anniversary celebrations. This year the political keynote is the commemoration of the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics fifty years ago. On 30 December 1922, at the first All-Union Congress of Soviets, Lenin proclaimed the amalgamation of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic with the Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Transcaucasian Soviet Republics into a unified state. By the end of February the Central Committee of the CPSU had already published guidelines for the celebration, triggering off an intensive campaign throughout the country.

As in earlier celebrations typical for the Brezhnev regime, such as the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution in 1967 or the 1970 Lenin Centennial, the population is again being summoned to greater work efforts and early fulfillment of plans in honor of the founding of the Soviet Union. Reference to this "important historical event" also serves, of course, as retrospective justification for the present reactionary leadership and its self-portrayal as the perpetuator of the true Leninist tradition. The main emphasis this year will be on confirmation and glorification of Soviet nationalities policy. The Soviet leaders are using the occasion of the anniversary to come to grips with the troublesome issue of growing nationality problems in their multinational country. Apparently this issue is causing them more and more worry. Even in the early stages, the preparations for this year's celebration show that behind the facade of the "socialist community of nations" complex national forces are at work, although by Communist class theory and after half a century of Soviet oppression and imposition of uniformity such tendencies should have been eliminated.

### Brezhnev's "Soviet Patriotism"

The Central Committee's guidelines of 22 February and subsequent editorials and commentaries in the Party press have underscored the crucial importance of the nationalities question, as one of the "key sectors in the battle between socialism and capitalism, between Marxism-Leninism and bourgeois and revisionist ideology." Currently intoned hymns to "Leninist nationalities policy" end in the refrain that respect for all peoples and nationalities must be combined with "rejection of remnants of nationalism and chauvinism as well as regionalism." Yet the Party ideologists avoid the kind of ideological, psychological or sociological interpretation of the nationalities question that has caused such headaches to Marxist theorists, and limit themselves to the dogmatic assertion that the nationalities question is subordinate to the interests of the class struggle. Lenin, who at least in theory favored the right of peoples to self-determination and secession and prophesized the withering away of the state, is glorified as the founder of the Soviet Union. The forcible unification of over a

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

hundred nationalities in the Soviet state, which entailed such great sacrifices, is portrayed in historical retrospect as a harmonious idyll. Particularly conspicuous is the positive significance attributed to Stalin's 1936 Constitution and the "reunification" of the Ukraine and Byelorussia as well as the annexation of the Baltic states, made possible by the Stalin-Hitler pact.

Brezhnev's nationalities policy leaves no room for independence or individuality to the Soviet peoples. In keeping with Brezhnev's "power and unity" policy, it calls for the "concentration of all power of the multinational Soviet state." Pravda amplified this guideline to mean that the "national unity of the Soviet fatherland is assured by its invincible defense force" and that the Soviet Army "embodies the combat solidarity of the socialist nations." In the Soviet Union, we are told, distinctions and differences between nationalities have disappeared, making way for a super-nation, the "Soviet people," as a new national enity finding expression in the "Soviet partiotism" of "Soviet man." The anniversary celebration is an occasion for inculcating this "Soviet patriotism" into the masses and intensifying their "internationalistic education." Each week Pravda devotes an editorial to this theme, setting as the main task "to awaken in every Soviet patriot a fighting intolerance toward national prejudices," and calling for an "uncompromising struggle against tendencies toward national separatism and exclusiveness, glorification of the past and glossing over social contradictions in national history, against customs and mores that interfere with Communist construction."

Non-Russian Stirrings

The sudden interest of the Soviet leaders in national questions is undoubtedly connected with growing manifestations of national consciousness and independence among the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union. Numerous reports of protests by oppressed minorities and persecution of national groups add up to a picture of rising discontent and unrest. Best known are the demonstrations by Soviet Jews, drawing world attention to their religious and national oppression and attempting to force the issue of emigration to Israel. Recently seventeen old Communists from Latvia wrote a letter to the West European Communist parties, protesting against growing Russification of the Baltic republics and calling for support. Rising nationalism has also led to Party tirades against "bourgeois nationalism" in other republics, such as Belorussian, Georgia, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan, and to the scolding of Party organizations, such as the municipal Party in Tiflis, for "inadequate internationalistic orientation." There is a constant call everywhere for "internationalistic education" of youth and intelligentsia in the Union republics that seem to be particularly prone to nationalism.

This applies first and foremost to the Ukraine, where the nationalities question has become acute and where a purge is in progress against nationalist deviations among writers and students. A new note appeared in these internal tensions when Radyanska Ukraina recently accused the "nationalists" of playing the "Chinese card," sympathizing with Peking's standpoint in the border question, counting

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

on a military conflict between the Soviet Union and China, and hoping for Chinese assistance in creating a "new Ukraine."

But the Party propagandists themselves play the Chinese game in their attacks on nationalism, in that on the one hand they link bourgeois nationalism to Maoism while citing on the other hand the oppression of minorities in China as a warning example, which must remind many non-Russian readers in the Soviet Union of their own situation. Moscow has a hard time explaining why "remnants of nationalism" survive after 50 years of centralism, egalitarianism and "Leninist nationalities policy." Soviet propaganda takes the easy way by branding nationalist trends as inspired from abroad, blaming them on imperialism and "left and right revisionism," forces that use "anti-Sovietism" and the "poisoned weapon of nationalism" in the bitter ideological struggle.

Demographic Shifts

There are deeper reasons, and more real ones, for the increasing national problem in the Soviet Union, in many ways comparable to the Negro question in the United States. Due to economic development, defense decentralization, and a shift in the Soviet domestic and foreign political center of gravity toward Asia, demographic displacements and social mobility have affected the non-Russian union republics as well as the Russian. The census of January 1970, with a total population figure of 241.7 million, showed only a little over half of that number to be Russians (with a drop between 1959 and 1970 from 58 to 53 percent); the time is approaching when the non-Russian population in the Soviet Union will form a majority. While between 1960 and 1970 the percentage of indigenous nationalities -- Baltic, Byelorussian, Ukrainian and Moldavian -- in the Western union republics receded and the percentage of Russians increased, the contrary development occured in the Caucasian and Central Asian republics: the number of Russians diminished and that of the indigenous inhabitants rose. The following figures from the Central Statistical Administration, for 7 April 1971, give an indication of the extent of Russification in the various Union republics.

| | 1959 | 1970 |
|---|---|---|
| RSFSR | 117.5 million | 130.0 million |
| percentage of Russians | 83.3 % | 82.2 % |
| Latvia | 2.9 million | 2.4 million |
| Latvians | 62.0 percent | 56.8 percent |
| Russians | 26.6 % | 29.8 % |
| Estonia | 1.2 million | 1.4 million |
| Estonians | 74.6 % | 68.2 % |
| Russians | 20.1 % | 24.4 % |
| Ukraine | 41.9 million | 47.1 million |
| Ukrainians | 76.8 % | 74.9 % |
| Russians | 16.9 % | 19.4 % |

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Moldavia | 2.9 million | 3.6 million |
| Moldavians | 65.4 % | 64.6 % |
| Russians | 10.2 % | 11.6 % |
| Belorussia | 8.0 million | 9.0 million |
| Belorussians | 81.1 % | 81.0 % |
| Russians | 8.2 % | 10.4 % |
| Lithuania | 2.7 million | 3.1 million |
| Lithuanians | 79.3 % | 80.1 % |
| Russians | 8.5 % | 8.6 % |
| Kazakhstan | 9.2 million | 12.8 million |
| Kazakhs | 29.8 % | 32.4 % |
| Russians | 43.2 % | 42.8 % |
| Kirghizstan | 2.0 million | 2.9 million |
| Kirghiz | 40.5 % | 43.8 % |
| Russians | 30.2 % | 29.2 % |
| Turkmenistan | 1.5 million | 2.2 million |
| Turkmenians | 60.9 % | 65.6 % |
| Russians | 17.3 | 14.5 % |
| Uzbekistan | 8.3 million | 12.0 million |
| Uzbeks | 61.1 % | 64.7 % |
| Russians | 13.5 % | 12.5 % |
| Tadzhikistan | 2.0 million | 2.9 million |
| Tadzhiks | 53.0 % | 56.2 % |
| Russians | 13.3 % | 11.9 % |
| Azerbaidzhan | 3.7 million | 5.1 million |
| Azerbaidzhanians | 67.5 % | 73.8 % |
| Russians | 13.6 % | 10.0 % |
| Georgia | 4.0 million | 4.7 million |
| Georgians | 64.3 % | 66.8 % |
| Russians | 10.1 % | 8.5 % |
| Armenia | 1.8 million | 2.5 million |
| Armenians | 88.0 % | 88.6 % |
| Russians | 3.2 % | 2.7 % |

There is also food for thought for the Soviet leaders in the February report by Kommunist Tadzhikistana that in the period from 1939 to 1959 the population of the European USSR grew by only 3.8 percent, as against 35.6 percent population increase for the Asiatic part of the country.

It appears rather doubtful whether greater mobility, better education and a higher living standard are indeed leading to the integration of the Soviet nationalities. Economic and technological development also creates new tension in the social sphere and greater self-awareness among the various nationalities. Thus, Pravda wrote

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
on 26 February about the effects of the growing labor shortage in Latvia, leading to "unhealthy phenomena in labor recruitment" and to gap between Soviet economic requirements and the social and professional orientation of youth. The "lack of people," cited by Brezhnev at the 24th Party Congress, forces the leadership to pay closer attention to the nature and needs of the non-Russian peoples. The latter are fully aware of Moscow's concern for self-determination among the Irish, Arabs or Bengalis, without much left over for the rights of its own minorities. The activity of the Soviet Jews seems to have made an impression on the other minorities: this may be one reason why the regime is permitting Jewish activists to emigrate to Israel, to get rid of the source of trouble.

External Effect

The Central Committee guidelines frankly spell out the fact that the renewed focus on the national question has to do with foreign policy as well. All defense measures notwithstanding, the credibility of Soviet power and prestige would suffer if the country's inner fabric were threatened by social and national tensions. Unification and integration of the peoples inside the Soviet Union is held up as a nodel for cooperation and "internationalistic unity" of the socialist states, and it is hinted that the development in East Europe will be analogous to that which took place when the Soviet Union was unified. Such an amalgamation process will lead the East European peoples to a greater unity. And beyond that, the solution of the national question in the Soviet Union is seen as exemplary for coexistence of peoples in the whole world. This is clearly an attempt to present the Soviet Union to the Third World nations not only as guardian of their national aspirations, but also as the model for solving national disputes. Any question concerning imperialistic and colonialist treatment of the Soviet peoples is shunted aside. Moscow's intervention in external national conflicts has been intensified. The Soviets do not hesitate to make clandestine use of irredentism and secessionist trends, such as in the Balkans and in China. But that very interference increases the likelihood of a backlash in the Soviet minority regions, heightening the sensitivity of those nationalities to exploitation and oppression. And last but not least, the growing national problems in the Soviet Union, frought as they are with explosive possibilities, are a consequence of Brezhnev's domestic and foreign policies. Those policies are increasingly nationalistic in the Great Russian sense.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

# Nationalismen in der Sowjetunion

*Kx.* Wieder einmal bereitet Moskau große *Jubiläumsfeiern* vor. Die sowjetische Politik steht in diesem Jahr im Zeichen der Erinnerung an die *Gründung der Union der Sozialistischen Sowjetrepubliken* vor fünfzig Jahren, als Lenin am 30. Dezember 1922 auf dem Ersten Allunions-Kongreß der Sowjets den Zusammenschluß der Russischen Sozialistischen Föderativen Sowjetrepublik mit den ukrainischen, bjelorussischen und transkaukasischen Sowjetrepubliken zu einem Einheitsstaat proklamierte. Das Zentralkomitee der KPdSU hat bereits Ende Februar die Richtlinien für die Vorbereitung dieses Jubiläums veröffentlicht, die eine intensive Kampagne im ganzen Land einleiteten.

Wie bei den früheren Feiern, die für die Herrschaft Breschnews charakteristisch geworden sind, etwa zum 50. Jahrestag der Oktoberrevolution 1967 oder zum Lenin-Zentenarium 1970, wird auch diesmal die Bevölkerung zu größeren Arbeitsleistungen und vorzeitiger Planerfüllung zu Ehren der Gründung der Sowjetunion aufgerufen. Die Erinnerung an dieses «wichtige historische Ereignis» dient natürlich auch der rückblickenden Rechtfertigung der heutigen reaktionären Führung und ihrer Selbstdarstellung als Träger der wahren Tradition Lenins. Dazu kommt als eigentlicher Schwerpunkt der diesjährigen Feiern die Bestätigung und Verherrlichung der *sowjetischen Nationalitätenpolitik.* Die Sowjetführung ergreift die Gelegenheit dieses runden Jahrestags, um das heiße Eisen der wachsenden Nationalitätenprobleme in ihrem Vielvölkerstaat anzupacken, das ihr offensichtlich immer größere Sorgen bereitet. Schon die anlaufenden Vorbereitungen für die Jubiläumsfeiern lassen erkennen, daß hinter der Fassade der «sozialistischen Völkergemeinschaft» *komplexe nationale Strömungen* im Wachsen sind, die eigentlich nach kommunistischer Klassentheorie und nach einem halben Jahrhundert sowjetischer Unterdrückungs- und Gleichschaltungspraxis als versiegt angesehen wurden.

## Breschnews «Sowjetpatriotismus»

Die ZK-Richtlinien vom 22. Februar und die in ihrem Gefolge erschienenen zahlreichen Leitartikel und Kommentare der Parteipresse heben die entscheidende Bedeutung der nationalen Frage hervor, die zu den «schärfsten Frontabschnitten des Kampfes zwischen Sozialismus und Kapitalismus, zwischen Marxismus-Leninismus und bourgeoiser und revisionistischer Ideologie» gehöre. Die jetzt angestimmten Hymnen auf die «leninistische Nationalitätenpolitik» enden mit dem Refrain, daß Achtung für alle Völker und Nationalitäten mit «Unversöhnlichkeit gegenüber Ueberresten des Nationalismus und Chauvinismus und Erscheinungen des Lokalismus» verbunden werden müsse. Die Parteiideologen weichen allerdings [illegible] logischen Interpretation der Nationalitätenfrage aus, an der sich mancher marxistische Theoretiker die Zähne ausgebissen hat, und begnügen sich mit der dogmatischen Behauptung, die Nationalitätenfrage sei den Interessen des Klassenkampfes untergeordnet. *Lenin,* der zumindest in seiner Theorie für das *Selbstbestimmungs- und Sezessionsrecht der Völker* eingetreten war und das «Absterben des Staates» prophezeit hatte, wird als Gründer des sowjetischen Einheitsstaates gefeiert. Der gewaltsame und opferreiche Zusammenschluß der *über hundert Nationalitäten des Sowjetstaats* erscheint im historischen Rückblick als eine harmonische Idylle, wobei besonders auffällt, welche positive Bedeutung ausgerechnet Stalins Verfassung von 1936 und der durch Stalins Pakt mit Hitler ermöglichten «Wiedervereinigung» der Ukraine und Bjelorußlands und dem Anschluß der baltischen Staaten zugeschrieben wird.

Die Nationalitätenpolitik Breschnews läßt keinen Raum für Selbständigkeit oder «eigenen Weg» der Sowjetvölker. Sie verlangt im Sinne von Breschnews auf «Macht und Einheit» gerichteter Politik die «Konzentration aller Macht des multinationalen Sowjetstaats». Die «Prawda» verdeutlichte diese Richtlinie des ZK in dem Sinne, daß die «staatliche Einheit des sowjetischen Vaterlandes die Schaffung seiner unbesiegbaren Verteidigungsmacht sichere» und die Sowjetarmee die «Verkörperung der Kampfgemeinschaft der sozialistischen Nationen» sei. In der Sowjetunion, so wird behauptet, seien Unterschiede und Gegensätze zwischen den Völkern verschwunden. An ihre Stelle trete eine Uebernation, das «Sowjetvolk», als eine neue nationale Qualität, die im «Sowjetpatriotismus» des «Sowjetmenschen» ihren Ausdruck finde. Aus Anlaß des Jubiläumsjahrs soll den Massen dieser «Sowjetpatriotismus» eingeimpft und ihre «internationalistische Erziehung» intensiviert werden. Die «Prawda» kommt jede Woche in einem Leitartikel auf dieses Thema zurück, bezeichnet als Hauptaufgabe, «in jedem Sowjetpatrioten eine kämpferische Unversöhnlichkeit gegen nationale Vorurteile zu wecken», und fordert den «kompromißlosen Kampf gegen Tendenzen der nationalen Abgrenzung und Ausschließlichkeit, der Verherrlichung der Vergangenheit und der Vertuschung der sozialen Gegensätze in der Geschichte der Völker, gegen Sitten und Gebräuche, die den kommunistischen Aufbau hindern».

## Nichtrussische Regungen

Das plötzliche Interesse der Sowjetführer für nationale Fragen hängt sicher mit immer deutlicher hervortretenden *Regungen nationaler Identifizierung und Selbständigkeit* unter den *nichtrussischen* Völkern der Sowjetunion zusammen. Berichte häufen sich über Proteste unterdrückter Minderheiten und über Verfolgung nationaler Gruppen, die sich zu einem Bild wachsender nationaler Unzufriedenheit und Unrast zusammenfügen. Am bekanntesten sind die Demonstrationen sowjetischer *Juden* geworden, um die Welt auf [illegible] aufmerksam zu machen, [illegible]

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

merksam zu machen und ihre Auswanderung nach Israel zu erzwingen. Kürzlich wandten sich 17 alte Kommunisten aus *Lettland* in einem Brief an die westeuropäischen kommunistischen Parteien, in dem sie gegen die fortschreitende Russifizierung in den baltischen Unionsrepubliken protestierten und nach Unterstützung riefen. Wenn in anderen Unionsrepubliken, etwa *Bjelorußland, Georgien, Turkmenistan* und *Kasachstan*, Parteifunktionäre in jüngster Zeit heftiger denn je gegen «bourgeoisen Nationalismus» auftreten und Parteiorganisationen, wie zum Beispiel kürzlich die Stadtpartei von *Tiflis*, wegen ungenügender «internationalistischer Orientierung» gerügt werden, so kann daraus auf ein Zunehmen nationaler Tendenzen geschlossen werden. Ueberall und immer wieder wird eine «internationalistische Erziehung» für Jugend und Intelligenz in den Unionsrepubliken gefordert, die offensichtlich für die verurteilten nationalen Tendenzen besonders anfällig zu sein scheinen.

Dies gilt in erster Linie für die *Ukraine*, wo die Nationalitätenfrage sehr akut geworden ist und eine Säuberungswelle gegen nationalistische Abweichungen unter Schriftstellern und Studenten geführt wird. Dabei ist auch ein neues Element dieser internen Spannungen aufgedeckt worden, als «Radjanska Ukraina» unlängst den «Nationalisten» vorwarf, sie versuchten die *«chinesische Karte»* zu spielen, sympathisierten mit dem Standpunkt Pekings in der Grenzfrage, rechneten mit einem militärischen Konflikt zwischen der Sowjetunion und China und hofften auf chinesische Hilfe bei der Schaffung einer «neuen Ukraine».

Allerdings spielt die Parteipropaganda in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Nationalismus selbst gerne die chinesische Karte, indem sie einerseits den «bürgerlichen Nationalismus» mit dem Maoismus in Zusammenhang bringt, anderseits die Unterdrückung der Minoritäten in China als abschreckendes Beispiel anführt, das allerdings manche nichtrussische Leser in der Sowjetunion eher an ihr eigenes Schicksal erinnern dürfte. Moskau fällt es schwer, das Fortbestehen oder Wiederauftauchen von «Ueberresten des Nationalismus» nach 50 Jahren Zentralismus, Gleichschaltung und «leninistischer Nationalitätenpolitik» zu erklären. Die sowjetische Propaganda macht es sich leicht, indem sie nationale Regungen als *«ausländisch» inspiriert* hinstellt und dem Imperialismus sowie dem «linken und rechten Revisionismus» in die Schuhe schiebt, die sich im verschärften ideologischen Kampf des «Anti-Sowjetismus» und der «vergifteten Waffe des Nationalismus» bedienten.

### Demographische Verschiebungen

Es gibt tiefere und objektivere Gründe für die Zunahme nationaler Probleme in der Sowjetunion, die in mancher Hinsicht mit der *Negerfrage in den Vereinigten Staaten* verglichen werden können. Demographische Verschiebungen und soziale Mobilität haben auch die nichtrussischen Unionsrepubliken erfaßt, als Folge der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung, verteidigungspolitischer Dezentralisierungsmaßnahmen und einer Schwergewichtsverlagerung der sowjetischen Innen- und Außenpolitik nach Asien. Nach der Volkszählung vom Januar 1970 waren von der Gesamtbevölkerung von 241,7 Millionen nur knapp über die Hälfte Russen (deren Anteil von 1959—70 von 58 auf 53 Prozent zurückging), die Zeit nähert sich da die nichtrussischen Völker in der Sowjetunion die *Mehrheit* bilden werden. Während zwischen 1960 und 1970 in den westlichen Unionsrepubliken der Prozentsatz der einheimischen Nationalitäten, der baltischen Völker, Bjelorussen, Ukrainer und Moldawier zurückging und der der Russen zunahm, geht in den kaukasischen und zentralasiatischen Republiken die Entwicklung umgekehrt; der Anteil der Russen nahm ab, und die jeweiligen «Staatsvölker» wuchsen an. Ueber Ausmaß und Entwicklung der «Russifizierung» in den einzelnen Unionsrepubliken geben die folgenden Angaben der Zentralen Statistischen Verwaltung vom 17. April 1971 Aufschluß:

| | *1959* | *1970* |
|---|---|---|
| Russische Unionsrepublik | 117,5 Mio. | 130,0 Mio. |
| davon Russen | 83,3 % | 82,2 % |
| Lettland | 2,9 Mio. | 2,4 Mio. |
| Letten | 62,0 % | 56,8 % |
| Russen | 26,6 % | 29,8 % |
| Estland | 1,2 Mio. | 1,4 Mio. |
| Esten | 74,6 % | 68,2 % |
| Russen | 20,1 % | 24,4 % |
| Ukraine | 41,9 Mio. | 47,1 Mio. |
| Ukrainer | 76,8 % | 74,9 % |
| Russen | 16,9 % | 19,4 % |
| Moldau | 2,9 Mio. | 3,6 Mio. |
| Moldawier | 65,4 % | 64,6 % |
| Russen | 10,2 % | 11,6 % |
| Bjelorußland | 8,0 Mio. | 9,0 Mio. |
| Bjelorussen | 81,1 % | 81,0 % |
| Russen | 8,2 % | 10,4 % |
| Litauen | 2,7 Mio. | 3,1 Mio. |
| Litauer | 79,3 % | 80,1 % |
| Russen | 8,5 % | 8,6 % |
| Kasachstan | 9,2 Mio. | 12,8 Mio. |
| Kasachen | 29,8 % | 32,4 % |
| Russen | 43,2 % | 42,8 % |
| Kirgisistan | 2,0 Mio. | 2,9 Mio. |
| Kirgisen | 40,5 % | 43,8 % |
| Russen | 30,2 % | 29,2 % |
| Turkmenistan | 1,5 Mio. | 2,2 Mio. |
| Turkmenen | 60,9 % | 65,6 % |
| Russen | 17,3 % | 14,5 % |
| Usbekistan | 8,3 Mio. | 12,0 Mio. |
| Usbeken | 61,1 % | 64,7 % |
| Russen | 13,5 % | 12,5 % |
| Tadschikistan | 2,0 Mio. | 2,9 Mio. |
| Tadschiken | 53,1 % | 56,2 % |
| Russen | 13,3 % | 11,9 % |
| Aserbeidschan | 3,7 Mio. | 5,1 Mio. |
| Aserbeidschaner | 67,5 % | 73,8 % |
| Russen | 13,6 % | 10,0 % |
| Georgien | 4,0 Mio. | 4,7 Mio. |
| Georgier | 64,3 % | 66,8 % |
| Russen | 10,1 % | 8,5 % |
| Armenien | 1,8 Mio. | 2,5 Mio. |
| Armenier | 88,0 % | 88,6 % |
| Russen | 3,2 % | 2,7 % |

Den Sowjetführern dürfte auch die Tatsache zu denken geben, auf die Anfang Februar in «Kommunist Tadschikistana» hingewiesen wurde, daß von 1939 bis 1959 die Bevölkerung des *europäischen* Teils der Sowjetunion nur um 3,8 Prozent wuchs, die des *asiatischen* Teils jedoch um 35,6 Prozent.

Ob größere Mobilität, höhere Bildung und besserer Lebensstandard zu der behaupteten Verschmelzung der Sowjetvölker führen, scheint eher zweifelhaft zu sein. Die wirtschaftlich-technische Entwicklung erzeugt auch neue soziale Spannungen und größeres Selbstbewußtsein in den Regio-

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

nen. So wies die «Prawda» am 26. Februar auf die Folgen des wachsenden Arbeitskräftemangels in Lettland hin, der zu «ungesunden Erscheinungen in der Rekrutierung von Arbeitskräften» geführt und einen Gegensatz zwischen den Bedürfnissen der Sowjetwirtschaft und der sozialen und beruflichen Orientierung der Jugend erzeugt habe. Der «Mangel an Menschen», auf den Breschnew auf dem 24. Parteitag hingewiesen hatte, zwingt die Führung, auf Eigenart und Ansprüche der nichtrussischen Völker größere Rücksicht zu nehmen. Diesen ist es nicht entgangen, daß Moskau zwar für die Selbstbestimmung der *Iren, Araber* oder *Bengalen* eintritt, für größere Rechte der eigenen Minderheiten aber nicht viel übrig hat. Die Aktivität der sowjetischen Juden scheint auch anderen Völkern in der Sowjetunion Eindruck gemacht zu haben, und dies mag vielleicht auch ein Grund sein, daß die Führung die Uebersiedlung aktiver Juden nach Israel gestattet, um diese als Zündstoff zu entfernen.

### Wirkung nach außen

Die Richtlinien des ZK sprechen offen aus, daß das gegenwärtige Aufgreifen der nationalen Frage auch außenpolitische Absichten verfolgt. Gewicht und Macht der Sowjetunion wären trotz allen Rüstungsanstrengungen nicht mehr glaubhaft, wenn ihr inneres Gewebe durch soziale und nationale Spannungen gefährdet würde. Der Zusammenschluß und die Verschmelzung der Völker im Rahmen der Sowjetunion werden als Vorbild für die Zusammenarbeit und die «internationalistische Einheit» der sozialistischen Staaten hingestellt, und es wird angedeutet, daß sich innerhalb des *Ostblocks* eine ähnliche Entwicklung wie beim Zusammenschluß der Sowjetunion abspielen werde, die zur Verschmelzung der Völker Osteuropas zu einer größeren Einheit führe. Die Lösung der nationalen Frage in der Sowjetunion wird darüber hinaus als Beispiel für das Zusammenleben der Völker in der ganzen Welt hingestellt. Das Bemühen ist deutlich, den Staaten der Dritten Welt die Sowjetunion nicht nur als Beschützer ihres nationalen Strebens vorzustellen, sondern auch als Modell für die Lösung von nationalen Streitigkeiten. Fragen nach der imperialistischen und kolonialistischen Behandlung der Sowjetvölker weist man zurück. Gerade die stärkere Einmischung Moskaus in die nationalen Auseinandersetzungen in der übrigen Welt, wobei es vor geheimer Ausnutzung von Irredentismus und Sezessionsstreben, etwa auf dem Balkan und in China, nicht zurückschreckt, macht den sowjetischen Machtbereich jedoch anfälliger für Rückwirkungen bei den nichtrussischen Völkern der Sowjetunion und weckt ihr Bewußtsein gegenüber Unterdrückung und Ausbeutung. Nicht zuletzt sind die wachsenden nationalen Probleme in der Sowjetunion, die sich als gefährlich explosives Potential erweisen könnten, eine Folge der Innen- und Außenpolitik *Breschnews*, die immer mehr nationalistische, *großrussische* Züge annimmt.

## Zehn Jahre unabhängiges Algerien

### Rückblick auf Evian

*Ch. R. Tunis, im März*

Ein Teil der *französischen Presse* hat — zumeist mit Bitterkeit — den zehnten Jahrestag der Abkommen von Evian im März 1962 in Erinnerung gerufen. In Algerien wurde das zehnjährige Vertragsjubiläum kaum erwähnt. Diese Abkommen beendeten den *französisch-algerischen Krieg*, der 1954 begonnen hatte. Allerdings dauerten nach ihrem Abschluß die Gewalttätigkeiten noch mehr als zwei Monate an, besonders infolge der Aktivität der französischen Terrororganisation OAS *(Organisation armée secrète)*. Diese sozusagen «illegale» Verlängerung des Konflikts hatte für alle Beteiligten, insbesondere für die Franzosen, schwerwiegende Konsequenzen. Als in der Folge von algerischer Seite gewisse Punkte der Abkommen verletzt wurden, wurde geltend gemacht, daß gegen die Abmachungen zuerst von französischer Seite verstoßen worden sei. Es kam aber auch zu blutigen *Abrechnungen* von Angehörigen der algerischen Befreiungsbewegung mit Landsleuten, die sich auf der Seite der Franzosen gehalten hatten, wie auch zu Racheakten gegen Franzosen. In Scharen verließen bereits damals französische Bewohner das Land. Eine nach dem Abschluß der Verträge eingesetzte provisorische Exekutive unter dem Vorsitz von *Abderrahmane Farès* gelangte schließlich zu einer Art Friedensabkommen mit der OAS.

Mit großer Spannung wurden vor zehn Jahren die Gesprächsergebnisse der Unterhändler von Evian erwartet. Zuerst allerdings erhoben die algerischen Vertreter jedesmal Einspruch, wenn ein Teil der Abmachungen zur Unterzeichnung gelangen sollte, und schlugen andere Lösungen vor. Diese Interventionen wurden von *Aulnoy* in Frankreich aus gesteuert, wo die Vizepräsidenten der algerischen Exilregierung (GPRA), Ben Bella, Aït Ahmed, Boudiaf, Khider und Bitat, immer noch inhaftiert waren. Sie galten als die eigentlichen Führer im algerischen Krieg. Der einzige Vizepräsident, der sein Amt tatsächlich ausüben konnte, war *Belkacem Krim;* er residierte wie der Präsident der Exilregierung, *Ben Khedda,* in Tunis. Am 18. März 1962 wurde von Aulnoy aus ein neuer Vorschlag für die Abkommen gemacht. Belkacem Krim aber beendete das Hinauszögern der Verhandlungen, indem er den Vertrag unterzeichnete. Das Dokument, welches das Ende des Krieges in Algerien besiegelte, trägt in der Tat nur eine einzige algerische Unterschrift, jene von Belkacem Krim, während es auf französischer Seite von *Louis Joxe, Robert Buron* und *Jean de Broglie* unterzeichnet wurde. Die «Fünf von Aulnoy», wie man sie nannte, waren sehr ungehalten über das Vorgehen Belkacem Krims. Von ihrem Zwangsaufenthalt in Frankreich flogen sie nicht sofort nach Marokko, wo sie erwartet wurden, sondern fuhren zuerst in die Schweiz, nach Signal-de-Bougy, um der dort gebliebenen algerischen Delegation Vorwürfe wegen der Vertragsunterzeichnung zu machen.

Die Provisorische Regierung Algeriens war in Evian neben Belkacem Krim von Außenminister Saad-Dahlab, Informationsminister Yazid und Staatsminister Ben Tobbal vertreten. Belkacem Krim wurde im Oktober 1970 in Deutschland ermordet. *Saad-Dahlab* und *Ben Tobbal,* der Direktor einer Staatsgesellschaft ist, sowie der frühere Staatspräsident Ben Khedda, haben sich seit langem aus dem politischen Leben zurückgezogen. *Yazid* machte eine diplomatische Karriere und ist heute Botschafter in Beirut. Zur algerischen Delegation in Evian gehörten auch Benyahia, der zusammen mit Boumendjel im Juni 1960 die ersten Kontakte mit der französischen Regierung aufgenommen hatte, Boulharouf, Mostefai, Reda Malek und Oberst Ben Mostefa (sein Kriegsname war Si Amar). *Benyahia* ist gegenwärtig Hochschulminister und *Mostefai* Gouverneur der algerischen Zentralbank. *Malek* ist Botschafter in Moskau. In Evian [illegible] Verhandlungsdelegation.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Als schließlich Ben Bella, Boudiaf und die anderen Inhaftierten von Aulnoy nach Rabat kamen, wurde ihnen ein triumphaler Empfang zuteil, an welchem König Hassan II. und Prinz Moulay Abdallah teilnahmen. Eine große Menschenmenge, unter welcher sich auch zahlreiche algerische Flüchtlinge befanden, spendete den Heimkehrern Beifall. Der Festumzug machte halt vor dem kleinen Haus, in dem *Ferhat Abbas* wohnte, welcher als erster Präsident der Exilregierung geamtet hatte, aber ein Jahr zuvor abgesetzt worden war. Ferhat Abbas und Ben Bella umarmten sich bei der Begrüßung und sprachen längere Zeit freundschaftlich miteinander. Sechs Monate später, als Ben Bella zum Ministerpräsidenten der jungen algerischen Republik ernannt wurde, wählte man Ferhat Abbas zum Präsidenten der Konstitutionellen Nationalversammlung. Zwischen den beiden Männern traten jedoch bald tiefe Zerwürfnisse auf. Auch Ferhat Abbas hat sich längst ins Privatleben zurückgezogen.

Von den sogenannten «Fünf von Aulnoy» blieb nur ein einziger fast ohne Unterbruch in der Regierung: *Rabah Bitat*, welcher heute das Amt des Transportministers innehat. Der im Juni 1965 gestürzte erste Präsident der Republik. *Ben Bella*, wird an einem unbekannten Ort festgehalten. Man spricht kaum mehr von ihm. Letztes Jahr war zu erfahren, daß er sich verheiratet hat. Khider wurde vor einigen Jahren in Madrid ermordet; *Boudiaf* sowie *Ait Ahmed* haben sich ins Ausland abgesetzt.

CPYRGHT

THE NEW YORK TIMES
31 July 1972

CPYRGHT

# *Unrest Is Spurring Soviet to Meld Its 100 Nationalities*

By THEODORE SHABAD
Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, July 29—After 50 years of trying to knit 100 ethnic groups into a single society, the Soviet Union appears to have made great gains in the educational and cultural development of its nationalities. But it remains well short of the ultimate goal of total harmony.

The continuing existence of ethnic problems has been pointed up in this 50th anniversary year of the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by reports of nationalist unrest in Lithuania, charges of Russification in the Ukraine and attempts to glorify a non-Communist Georgian state that existed briefly more than 50 years ago.

But the most telling evidence of all seems to be the Communist ideologists' own avowed need at this late date to press a campaign for what is known here as "international indoctrination" of citizens, meaning the preaching of a higher degree of ethnic tolerance.

The problems faced by the Soviet Union are perhaps best illustrated by comparison with the United States, also composed of a wide range of ethnic elements.

While the trend in the United States has proceeded from the old melting-pot philosophy to a new affirmation of ethnic identity, a reverse long-term tendency seems evident in the Soviet Union, coupled with the policy of a vaguely defined integration of ethnic groups into a single Soviet nation.

It is the conflict between nationalist aspirations and the integration aim that appears to keep the ethnic issue alive.

### Frictions Rarely Made Public

Examples of ethnic friction are rarely made public in the controlled press and it is therefore difficult to judge their extent. But chance remarks by Soviet citizens and occasional references in plays and motion pictures suggest vestiges of prejudice and assertions of national feelings.

One Russian recently remarked at the time of President Nixon's visit to Moscow that he found greater affinity with Americans than with some of the Asian ethnic groups in the Soviet Union.

"I would not want my daughter to marry a Yakut," he asserted. The 300,000 Yakuts, a Turkic - speaking people of northeast Siberia with significant cultural gains under the Soviet regime, are of Mongol stock.

In the 1966 film, "Lebedev Against Lebedev," a bigot introduced to a Georgian physicist comments, "I know those physicists from the Central Market." He was alluding to the Georgian's flair for private enterprise in selling produce at the farmer markets operating outside the Government's retailing system.

In an effort to win the loyalty of the various ethnic groups inhabiting the old Russian empire, the Bolsheviks founded the Soviet state after the 1917 revolution on the principle of a complex network of autonomous ethnic territories coinciding roughly with the historical areas of settlement of the national groups.

Within the limits of its republic, region or other autonomous area, each ethnic group was given the right to foster an education and culture in its own language, but under the over-all umbrella of a Communist ideology. In terms of a widespread slogan, ethnic cultural development became "national in form and socialist in content."

Against this background of ethnic separateness, both the common ideological constraints and the predominant influence of the ethnic Russians—every second Soviet citizen is a Russian—have been major forces working for ultimate integration.

### Next Stage Is Foreseen

According to Communist doctrine, the blossoming of ethnic cultures is to bring about a further stage of development when national groups will disappear as distinct cultural and linguistic entities and be fused into "a single common socialist culture with a single common language."

In view of the predominant position of Russian, which not only is spoken by the 130 million ethnic Russians but is also the second language of 20 million non-Russians, there appears to be little doubt what the common language would ultimately be.

Nikita S. Khrushchev, the late Soviet leader, sought to accelerate the ethnic integration process by fostering regional economic agencies and other administrative forms of amalgamation in the Baltic republics, in Central Asia and in Transcaucasia. But his measures were abrogated after his fall from power in October, 1964, evidently because of opposition among the integrated republics.

Since then, integration has been encouraged at a more leisurely pace by exchanges of cultural delegations among republics, with Estonian writers and singers traveling, say, to Tadzhikistan in Central Asia, and Uzbek poets and artists touring the Moldavian Republic, adjoining Rumania.

Russians and their fellow Slavs, the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, are probably the most highly mobile and industrially skilled among the Soviet Union's ethnic groups and have been migrating to other republics to help staff construction projects and new industries.

In some areas, as in the Baltic republics of Estonia and Latvia, the Russian influx appears related to the inability of the indigenous population,

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

with a low rate of natural increase, to provide manpowetr for expanding industry. However, nationalistically minded Latvians and Estonians also fear a deliberate policy aimed at submerging the local cultures through Russian influx.

In Tallinn, the Estonian capital, for example, a new Russian evening newspaper, Vecherny Tallinn (Evening Tallinn), is beginning publication Aug. 1, presumably to meet the needs of the city's growing population. Russians accounted for 30 per cent of the city's population in 1959, and may now represent 40 per cent.

The movement of Russians into Central Asia and Kazakhstan has been associated with intensive industrial development in these regions, combined with apparent reluctance or inability of the indigenous rural population to move to the cities.

Sociological surveys have found that the poor knowledge of Russian among the rural Central Asians has been a major factor inhibiting their migration to cities, where Russian has become the key language in industry.

In the period between the last two population censuses, 1959 to 1970, the ethnic Russian element has been increasing in all non-Russian republics, except one. The exception is the Georgian Republic of Transcaucasia, where a strong feeling of ethnic identity combined with a high level of education and industrial skills has in fact resulted in a net outflow of ethnic Russians over the last decade.

Differences in ethnic attitudes are perhaps best illustrated by two contrasting areas such as culturally strong and homogenous Georgia, on the one hand, and the Republic of Kazakhstan, where the indigenous Kazakh population has been virtually submerged by inmigrants and now represents one-third of the total.

In Kazakhstan, where a new resource-oriented industrial economy has been superimposed on the indigenous stock-herding society, the officially controlled press likes to emphasize the "multinational character" of the labor force on construction projects, as representatives of "fraternal republics" join in Kazakhstan's economic development.

In Georgia, where industry and construction projects are staffed to a large extent with locally trained skilled labor, there are few references to outside aid in development projects, although the general ideological point of a rapprochement between the Soviet Union's ethnic groups is also frequently made in the press.

The process of integration probably advances most rapidly among some ethnic communities that, for historical or other reasons, are not concentrated in a particular area of settlement and lack some of the cultural facilities available within autonomous territories.

Largest among these groups is the Jewish community of more than two million, of whom perhaps one per cent live in the Siberian autonomous region of Birobidzhan allocated to the Soviet Union's Jews in the nineteen-thirties.

The absence of instruction in Yiddish and a scarcity of Jewish cultural institutions have fostered the process of assimilation that may portend the ultimate merger of all ethnic groups in the Soviet Union. An undetermined minority of Soviet Jews have sought to assert their ethnic identity by seeking emigration to Israel.

Other ethnic groups without a home area within the Soviet Union are the 1.9 million ethnic Germans and the 1.2 million ethnic Poles. They have been more fortunate than the Jews in asserting themselves as distinct communities, both because of a wider range of cultural facilities granted by the authorities and the fact that both East Germany and Poland are members of the Soviet bloc of nations.

CPYRGHT NEW YORK TIMES
20 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# Soviet Underground Urges Strikes to Raise Standards

By THEODORE SHABAD
Special to The New York Times

MOSCOW, June 19 — An underground appeal circulating in Moscow calls on Russians to strike and to demonstrate for better living conditions, as the Poles successfully did in 1970.

The typewritten document, reportedly stuffed into mailboxes of selected apartment buildings earlier this month, charges that the national wealth is being squandered both on a life of luxury among the privileged and on foreign aid for political purposes.

It paints economic conditions in dark terms, comparing them with the greater affluence in the West and making virtually no allowance for the improvement in the living conditions of the average citizen that has been evident to casual observers in recent years.

### Directed to the Workers

Couched in unusually blunt, aggressive language, the document is plainly directed at the average workingman, who has not been a significant element in dissent. The appeal focuses on what it describes as a steady rise in consumer prices and low wages, contrasting them with Soviet leaders' promises for a better life.

Citing comparative statistics, the document contends that workers here are lagging far behind those in the West in housing, consumer goods and services. It suggests that workers in the West achieved their comparatively high standard of living and broad political rights by fighting for them.

The appeal, signed "Citizens Committee," appears to represent an attempt by a dissident group to enlist ordinary citizens in a campaign for more rapid improvement of the standard of living and for broader political and civil rights.

Copies of the appeal, which is circulating in a short version of 200 words, a more detailed version of 600 words and a full-length version of 1,200 words, have been made available to Western newsmen.

### Intellectuals and Writers

The small dissident movement in the Soviet Union consists mainly of intellectals and writers without reaching the mass of the population. There is no way of ascertaining how significant a group sponsored the latest protest or how many people it reached.

Dissident sources said the sponsoring group was made up of engineers and members of the "technical intelligentsia." As many as a thousand copies were to have been distributed, it was said, but many were intercepted by opponents of the protest or the authorities.

The sources said that at least some of the leaflets had been produced by duplicating equipment. Private citizens are normally prohibited from owning printing presses or mimeograph machines, so that underground documents must be laboriously typed and retyped for dissemination.

No information could be obtained on the areas of distribution of the appeal, but judging from the target audience it was presumably directed to workingmen's residential neighborhoods.

In a reference to worker rioting in Poland in December, 1970, the document says that strikes and demonstrations resulting from consumer price increases achieved the aim of improved living conditions.

### Gomulka Ouster Recalled

Referring to the political upheaval, in which Wladyslaw Gomulka was replaced by Edward Gierek as the Polish Communist party leader, the underground appeal says in its full-length version: "As a result, Gomulka was removed and virtually the entire Central Committee and Government were replaced. Gierek, the new secretary of the Central Committee, canceled the price rise, raised wages and pensions, and softened censorship."

The administration of Mr. Gierek has been generally viewed as cautiously liberalizing policies in the economy and the cultural field.

The Moscow appeal was evidently timed to draw a parallel with the Polish events. It noted that June 1 marked the 10th anniversary of a rise of 30 to 50 per cent in meat and butter prices.

The price increase, ordered

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

under the leadership of Nikita S. Khrushchev, had been explained as a temporary measure designed to stimulate lagging agricultural production.

"It is now clear to the people," the document says, "that this was just another promise, just another outrageous lie of the Kremlin rulers."

**'Concealed' Price Rise**

It charges that over the last 10 years there have been further "concealed" price rises for foood and manufactured goods through changes in product assortment, reductions in quality and relabeling.

The two basic complaints—that a privileged class is living at the expense of the workers and that a costly foreign-aid program is hurting Soviet citizens—have been made by dissidents before. How widely the complaints are shared cannot be determined.

Such charges were made, for example, by Dr. Andrei D. Sakharov, the physicist in the widely circulated critique of Soviet policy known as "Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual freedom." The document, which reached the West in 1968, was one of the first [illegible] a growing wave of underground protests.

The latest appeal listed foreign-aid figures that are not usually made public. Without citing sources, the document said as much as 3 million rubles (about $3.7 million at the official rate) was being spent daily on aid to North Vietnam, 1.5 million for the Arabs and a million for Cuba.

The figures for the Arabs and Cuba appeared to agree with Western estimates, but the volume for Hanoi seemed surprisingly high, perhaps reflecting the height of the program in the middle nineteen-sixties.

**Soviet Strikes Recalled**

e In calling for struggle through strikes and demonstrations, the appeal says such a movement had already begun. It refers to strikes over the last 10 years in the north Caucasus town of Novocherkassk, in the steel center of Temir-Tau, in Kazakhstan and in the city of Chirchik, in the Uzbek Republic of Central Asia. The official media have not reported such incidents, but information about them has circulated by word of mouth.

The document also refers to the demonstrations in Kaunas, Lithuania, last month after the self-immolation of a young man. The demonstrations are reported to have reflected a combination of nationalistic and Roman Catholic unrest in the Baltic republic.

Discussing the economy, the document says:

"An unemployed worker in the West can buy two to four times as many goods for his jobless benefit as our factory or office worker can buy for his working wage. Furthermore, the number of unemployed in the West does not exceed 2 to 4 per cent of the labor force. No wonder the Kremlin rulers jam foreign radio broadcasts. Even Hitler did not do that in peacetime."

Of the political system, it says:

"We have no socialism in our land! "How can there be socialism with 20 times as many spongers and bosses as there were in czarist Russia! How can it be socialism if the workingman's average wage is 100 rubles and the income of a high official several thousand a month!

"How can it be socialism if the people are virtually deprived of their most elementary rights: freedom of speech, of the press, of the right to strike, etc! It is precisely the absence of these rights that enables the Kremlinites secretly and openly and without pity to rob and oppress our people.

"And it is not toward Communism that we are going—that is all a lie! What we have is state capitalism, the worst and most rapacious system of government. This kind of pitilessly thieving and uncontrolled rule is what Germany had under Hitler's 'socialism.'"

"Respected citizens!" the document concludes. "Fight for your rights, for a better life. Defend one another, one for all and all for one. Only through struggle can we achieve a change for the better. If we won't fight, we will turn more and more into the slaves of the Communist party's upper crust, into draft animals. Long live freedom and democracy!"

NEWSWEEK
26 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# Inside Russia: Rare Voices of Protest

The Russian capacity for suffering is legendary. And for hundreds of years, folklore and literature have celebrated this peculiar genius of the Russian people to absorb boundless punishment from oppressive czars and commissars, cruel weather and economic privation, revolution and war. "It's as if all this pain has been ordained by God," explains a young Moscow student. "We grumble and suffer but always silently."

Now, however, a small band of Soviet dissidents has dared to speak out on the No. 1 issue in the Soviet Union: the harsh inequities of the nation's economy. Early this month, an anonymous group styling itself simply the "Citizens' Committee" stuffed more than 1,000 crudely mimeographed leaflets into letter boxes in various sections of Moscow. The broadside, which became available to NEWSWEEK last week, accused the Soviet ruling class of siphoning off the wealth of the nation while ordinary Russians continued to endure shortages of consumer goods. It called on the people to press for better economic conditions through strikes and unofficial demonstrations—techniques that are unknown in the Soviet version of the worker's paradise.

Not surprisingly, in a land where public protests are not cheerfully tolerated, the Moscow authorities became duly exercized by the surreptitious publishing effort. Acting swiftly, the KGB state security police confiscated every copy that they could get their hands on and questioned dozens of persons in a search for those who were responsible for writing the leaflet. Despite an effective grapevine for forbidden information, the leaflet itself was unlikely to have much impact since relatively few people saw it. Nonetheless, it was a significant departure for underground protest literature because, for the first time, it spotlighted the kind of economic problems that have an impact on each of the nation's 246 million people.

Indeed, in a way that was probably unintentional, the Citizens' Committee leaflet bore out the contention of Soviet Party General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev that the days when Russians stolidly "accepted privations and hardships are gone forever." According to the statistics put forth by the underground leafleteers, the standard of living in the Soviet Union ranks only 26th in the world—or dead last among the lands generally classified as developed nations. "Our workers can buy for their wages seven to twelve times less than an average American, British or West German worker," the Moscow protesters charged. "The average apartment of our working people is two to five times less spacious than [those of] the people in these countries. Eighty per cent of Americans have cars, 60 per cent of the British and 50 per cent of the Germans, but in the Soviet Union the percentage is 0.1. Western workers on unemployment compensation can buy two to four times as many things as an average employed Soviet worker."

The leaflet (box, next page) put the blame for all this squarely on "Kremlin officials"—and on two broad counts. It accused them of draining the nation's wealth in pursuit of political adventurism

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

abroad, both through export of luxury goods and the expensive arming of such clients as Cuba, North Vietnam and Egypt. And it protested the rulers' own special privilege at home. Party bigwigs rate special commissaries, hospitals, vacation resorts, green-fenced estates in Moscow's fashionable Lenin Hills, sumptuous dachas (some equipped with swimming pools, tennis courts, the latest in stereo rigs) and chauffeured limousines, preferably of a prestigious foreign make. Less well-known is the range of perquisites that accrue even to middle-echelon types—Central Committee staff members, anyone connected with the KGB, the Foreign Ministry or the Academy of Science plus favored writers, composers, filmmakers, ballerinas, Olympic-level athletes and senior military officers.

**Spared:** The existence of a privileged elite in Russia does not come as news. Yugoslav author Milovan Djilas called them "The New Class," and Russian novelist Mikhail Bulgakov once satirized them in "The Master and Margarita." Some of them, such as Victor Louis, a journalist who moonlights in mysterious semi-official jobs on the side, appear for all the world to live like ruble millionaires (NEWSWEEK, July 12, 1971). Yet, despite considerable gaps between the pay scale of, say, a skilled factory worker (about 134 rubles a month) and his factory director (up to 1,500 rubles monthly with bonuses), it is not strictly a matter of money that sets the Soviet "priviligentsia" apart from the mass of ordinary folks. Once he has reached a certain level of power, a party *apparatchiki*, for example, is forever spared such proletarian necessities as standing in lines or arguing face-to-face with a sullen store clerk.

Perhaps there is no better spot to sample the good life of the Soviet elite than at Academgorodok (Science Village), a new town of 50,000 situated, ironically enough, in Siberia. A spectacular oasis of privilege tucked away in a birch forest just outside of the grimy industrial city of Novosibirsk, it was founded in 1957 specifically to attract and pamper a community of top-notch scientists with the very finest in Soviet living. One mathematician and his wife there, for instance, occupy an apartment with a living room and two bedrooms, far more space than is ordinarily allotted to a childless couple elsewhere in the U.S.S.R. In the town's spiffy new restaurants and nightclubs, the scientists dine on salmon or caviar—traditional Russian delicacies that disappeared a decade ago when the authorities decided to divert such items to the export and fancy hotel trades. Moreover, the citizens of Academgorodok may order foreign publications that are barred from general circulation.

**Valuta:** Yet, for Russia's political, cultural and technical elite, access to foreign ideas and goods is not the end of the rainbow. The most coveted perquisite of all is a chance to travel abroad and to get a slice of other people's material abundance. Russian diplomats, commercial experts, performing artists such as Bolshoi dancers, exchange professors and visiting scientists tend to regard even a brief stay abroad as a not-to-be-missed opportunity to acquire their earnings in *valuta* (foreign currency). On their return, the valuta is converted to special *certifikati* that, almost magically, opens the doors to special luxury-goods shops in Russia that accept hard currency only. Indeed, Soviet *viezdnoi* (travelers) are known to hoard valuta so singlemindedly that, at a recent reception in Paris, a Russian dancer fainted from hunger, prompting an accompanying official to growl: "Save money, but for God's sake, eat to stay alive!"

Since the Soviet priviligentsia accounts for less than 1 per cent of the population, the question inevitably arises as to why the other 99 per cent permits an exclusive, entrenched privileged class to exist with apparent impunity. In part, the answer lies in the fact that the Soviet elite are masters of inconspicuous consumption. They tend to travel in their own circles detached from the proletarian masses and, by and large, they avoid brazen public displays of their special status. In addition, the average Soviet worker is convinced that he, too, has never had it so good. Every day, he is bombarded with statistics painting a rosy economic picture: consumer production up 10 per cent in the first quarter of this year, with an output that included 1.4 million TV sets, 224,000 motorcycles and over a million radios and record players. Recently, Premier Aleksei Kosygin himself promised that the average Russian will eat 100 to 120 pounds more meat per year by 1975 than he does now.

Still, the Soviet Union continues to maintain the fiction of a fully egalitarian, classless society, and its propaganda media rarely miss an opportunity to rail against "alien bourgeois materialism." The existing hypocrisy is not always successfully fogged over, and the sight of a VIP's mammoth *Chaika* limousine careening down a Moscow boulevard, blithely ignoring traffic signals, is likely to produce a public reaction of disgust. Yet the grumbling prompted by glimpses of arrogant privilege is tempered with remarks such as: "Well, I guess they deserve it. They work hard for the country."

As the Citizens' Committee leaflet demonstrated, however, there are a few Russians, at least, who now dare to speak out on the country's economic inequities. "As a result of the Nixon summit," says one dissident, "we are theoretically the equals of the United States, politically, diplomatically and militarily. But now there will be a lot of people taking all this seriously. They won't put up with [illegible]. They [illegible] the equal of the United States in everything from washing machines to hair curlers, in which we are still years behind the times." The clandestine circulation of protest leaflets may be only the most dramatic manifestation of the rising expectations among Soviet consumers. But it is hardly the only sign. Just the other day, a Soviet newspaper complained openly that, in a nation that seems suddenly to have become fashion conscious, there simply was not a sufficient supply of wide neckties available for sale.

## Protest in Lithuania

For more than a generation, the world has all but written off Lithuania. A plaything of the great powers, it was annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, overrun by the Germans during World War II and retaken by the Russians toward the end of the war. Since then, Lithuania, along with neighboring Latvia and Estonia, has been totally incorporated into the U.S.S.R., and Moscow has made every effort to stamp out any lingering traces of Lithuanian nationalism. But although the Kremlin has sent thousands of Lithuanian intellectuals into Siberian exile, it has never succeeded in stifling the nationalist impulse in the little Baltic state. And now, according to reports filtering out of the Baltic area, Lithuania is seething with unrest.

The trouble apparently began when the Soviet Government initiated a campaign of harassment against Lithuania's Roman Catholic Church, stepping up anti-church propaganda and arresting priests for teaching without a license. Some 80 per cent of Lithuania's 3.1 million citizens are Catholic, and earlier this year 17,000 of them signed a petition calling on the United Nations to ensure religious freedom in Lithuania. The petition was smuggled out, reportedly with the aid of Lithuanian Jews, and presented to U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim. But the protest did not stop there. On May 14, a 20-year-old student named Romas Kalanta burned himself to death in downtown Kaunas, the second-largest city in Lithuania. And in the days that followed, thousands of students surged through the streets of the city shouting "Freedom! Freedom!"

**Rioting:** The students were met by club-wielding police, who were unable to control them. Cars and buildings were set afire, and in the end the Soviet authorities were obliged to send in special state-police and paratroop units. By the time the rioting was contained, two policemen reportedly lay dead and 800 students were under arrest. Six hundred were later released, their long hair shorn by the police, but 200 others are still in jail, awaiting trial. Meanwhile the authorities, fearful that the Lithuanian example might inspire some of the Soviet Union's [illegible] have done

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

their best to discredit the demonstrators. The students, spattered the police, are advocates of free love, and Kalanta himself was a deranged drug addict.

But the fires of Lithuanian patriotism were not easily extinguished. In early June, another youth climbed to the top of a building in the town of Varena, [illegible] and plunged to a fiery death. And though the authorities in Kaunas have removed the body of Romas Kalanta from its original grave, reports have it that Lithuanians still come daily to place wreaths of flowers on the site of his im- [illegible] marked one expert, "were caught off guard by the intensity of Lithuanian nationalism. But they will bring this thing under control. They won't let Lithuania turn into another Czechoslovakia."

CPYRGHT

## 'THEY EXPLOIT THE WORKING CLASS'

CPYRGHT

Although the Moscow police quickly seized almost all the protest leaflets distributed last week by an anonymous "Citizens' Committee," NEWSWEEK's bureau chief, Jay Axelbank, obtained a copy of the text. Below, some excerpts:

"According to our economists, the salary of an average Soviet employee is actually only a third of [what] his real wages [should be]. But besides these concealed losses he pays taxes, and where is all this spent? By Kremlin officials ... This money is being spent on their luxurious life, on their dachas, villas, limousines, their enormous salaries and bonuses, on their special rations concealed from the people, special rest houses, hospitals and sanatoria. The Kremlin rulers live better than many czarist bureaucrats [of the past], and [yet] they call themselves the vanguard of the Soviet people. They exploit the working class, which can hardly make ends meet ...

"The second leakage of the people's income is abroad. The Kremlin rulers trade with Western and other countries, not caring for the interests of the people but having in mind only their adventurous political aims. They ... export large quantities of the highest quality goods: meat, butter, fish, caviar, grain, raw materials and other short-supply goods. At the same time we import grain from Canada, using our meager national gold reserves. Enormous sums are wasted for ammunition shipments to the so-called fighters for freedom—that is, to sustain dictatorial regimes in Egypt, Syria, Cuba, etc., which give military bases to the U.S.S.R. ... Several billions were spent on Mao Tse-tung; now he is enemy No. 1. We spent 3 million rubles a day to help North Vietnam seize South Vietnam and 1 million rubles a day for Cuba ...

"Esteemed citizens, the working people of Western countries have achieved their highest standards of living and ample political freedoms through struggle. The tested means of struggle are strikes and demonstrations. When in December 1970 price rises were announced in Poland, the workers struck and demonstrated [and Polish party chief Wladislaw] Gomulka was removed ... The time has come when our people should exercise this right too."

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS
26 June 1972

## Ask Letters in Behalf of Pyotr Grigorenko

CPYRGHT

Amnesty International has asked supporters of civil liberties to write the Soviet government, requesting that Major General Pyotr Grigorenko be released from forced confinement in a psychiatric hospital.

Grigorenko has been held since May 1969 as the result of his efforts to defend the rights of Crimean Tatars. "As far as we know," the organization stated in its June newsletter, "this is one of the longest continuous periods of confinement in a psychiatric hospital that a dissident in the USSR has ever undergone."

A commission was scheduled to rule some time in June on Grigorenko's further confinement.

The newsletter reported that a member of the Amnesty International staff had been able to speak by telephone with Grigorenko's wife. She said that she had last seen him on April 27, and that he had then appeared to be in reasonably good health. Earlier, Grigorenko had been reported ill as the result of brutal methods used to force him to abandon a hunger strike.



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

REVUE DE LA PRESSE SUISSE, Bern
5 July 1972

UN APPEL DE LA SECTION SUISSE DE "AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL"

RPS. La section suisse de "Amnesty International" a fait parvenir le lettre ouverte suivante au président de l'Union soviétique:

"Amnesty International est une organisation mondiale et neutre qui, dans tous les pays de la terre, travaille en faveur d'hommes et de femmes emprisonnés pour des motifs de croyance ou de conviction. Notre ligne de conduite est la Déclaration des droits de l'homme du 10 décembre 1948 promulgueepar les Nations Unies. Amnesty International accorde son soutien uniquement à des prisonniers qui n'ont propagé ni utilisé la violence. Les groupes d' "Amnesty International" de Aarau, Berne, Berthoud, Montreux et Soleure se font des soucis pour des prisonniers de votre pays. Malheureusement, nous avons dû constater que les autorités soviétiques n'ont jamais réagi à nos demandes de renseignements. Nous ne comprenons pas pourquoi nos demandes ont été ignorées. Même votre ambassade à Berne, à l'encontre d'autres ambassades, refuse une entrevue. Cette attitude nous conduit à éprouver de la défiance envers vos offices."

"Les groupes AI (Amnesty International) de la section suisse voudraient avoir des renseignements au sujet des hommes ci-après emprissonés dans votre pays: Boris Chilkrot, étudiant, 24 ans, Ecole de hautes Etudes électrotechniques à Léningrad, condamné en janvier 1970 à 3 de camps de travail, parce qu'il avait distribué des oeuvres de Ginzbourg et qu'il avait émis des remarques critiques au sujet du procès de ce dernier. Ivan Stepanovitch Souk, qui n'a pas fait d'opposition contre le régime pas plus qu'il n'a distribué de littérature antisoviétique et qui est emprisonné pour le seul fait de s'être intéressé à la culture ukrainienne; arrêté depuis juin 1970. Ivan Maximovitch Larin, 33 ans, arrêté en raison "d'activités antisoviétiques"; interné dans une clinique psychiatrique. Nicolai Ivanovitch Nicolaienko, ouvrier d'une fabrique de béton, condamné à 5 ans de prison pour le même motif. Vladislav Grigorievitch Nedobora, 39 ans, ingénieur, condamné à 3 ans de camp de travail pour avoir "calomnié le système soviétique et distribué des écrits "Samizdat": ces écrits contenaient des renseignements au sujet de la violation des droits de l'homme en Union soviétique, par exemple dans le cas des cliniques psychiatriques."

"Amnesty International" se dresse contre l'oppression de la liberté de manifester son opinion en Union soviétique et vous prie de revoir les cas cités ainsi que d'accorder l'amnistie aux prisonniers qui se trouvent sous les verrous pour le seul motif de leurs convictions politiques."

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0
INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS,
12 June 1972
CPYRGHT

# Call for Inquiry on Soviet Police-Psychiatry

[A major reason for the Soviet bureaucrats' imprisonment of Vladimir Bukovsky was the latter's courageous activities in defense of dissidents who are confined to mental hospitals because of their political opinions.

[Early in 1971, Bukovsky sent to the West 150 pages of material concerning six oppositionists diagnosed as mentally irresponsible by Soviet psychiatrists. He asked Western psychiatrists to give their opinions as to whether the diagnoses were justified by the documentary material.

[In response to Bukovsky's action, more than eighty European psychiatrists, psychologists, and other professionals in the field of mental health have signed the following call for an international commission of inquiry. We have translated the statement from the May 27 issue of *Rouge*, the weekly paper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

All of those in France who have read the documents compiled by Bukovsky—published under the title *Une nouvelle maladie mentale en URSS: l'Opposition* (A New Mental Illness in the USSR: Opposition)—have been deeply moved by them.

The letter that serves as an introduction to the book states: "In our country during recent years, a number of people considered mentally sound by their families and close friends have been sentenced to terms in psychiatric hospitals, including hospitals of a special type."

Bukovsky asks psychiatrists to take a position both on these internments and on the "psychiatric analyses" that claim to justify them.

This appeal affects us all, for various reasons:

- It touches everyone in that it concerns the guarantees of personal integrity and individual freedom that are incorporated—even if in a purely formal way—in all democratic constitutions and which cannot be jettisoned in the name of socialism without robbing that word of its very meaning.
- It especially touches doctors, who can view any use of medical science by a political regime for purposes of coercion, cruelty, or even torture, instead of for therapeutic purposes, only as a serious misuse if not a real perversion.
- It touches all workers in the field of "mental health" who, in conjunction with many progressive elements (especially in the Institutional Therapy Movement, formed in the spirit of the Resistance), have labored to change the definitions of insanity, the whole system of healing, and the commitment process.
- It touches all manual and intellectual workers who feel tied to the development of the October Revolution, and who know that the cause of the left, the cause of socialism in our country and throughout the world, has everything to lose in concealing crying abuses—even if only by maintaining diplomatic silence. Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin's crimes convinces us of this, if any convincing is necessary. The malpractices and crimes committed in the name of socialism, and not the denunciation of those crimes, are what play into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

*For all these reasons, we are responding to Bukovsky's appeal.*

Those of Bukovsky's documents that have reached us do not lead us to conclude that the patients' irresponsibility has been established; on the contrary, they bring to light a treatment of internees that is but a caricature of psychiatry.

The closed-door character of Bukovsky's trial, as well as its brevity, does not lead us to believe that the authorities have effectively refuted the statements in Bukovsky's collection of documents.

*Therefore,*

- Conscious of the fact that the danger of the repressive use of psychiatry exists everywhere, and recognizing that the toleration of a single case of its misuse, no matter where it occurs, would jeopardize its entire future;
- Convinced, moreover, that all of Soviet psychiatry could not be implicated in police atrocities;

The undersigned call for the creation of an international commission of inquiry to work ceaselessly to shed all possible light on the contents of Bukovsky's documents. □


Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Par cet appel, les signataires marquent leur volonté de répondre à l'appel de Boukovsky aux psychiatres du monde entier. En tant que tel, les signataires oeuvreront à faire la lumière quant aux internements, sévices, ..., pratiqués par le K.G.B. sous couverture de psychiatrie. Nous savons bien que ce qui est pratiqué dans les hopitaux spéciaux se justifie par une certaine psychiatrie cataloguant les non-conformistes, les contestataires, les révolutionnaires comme fous. Ces bases "scientifiques" -qui menacent en France - expliquent qu'en réalité le véritable problème posé par le dossier Boukovsky, c'est la question des libertés et du socialisme. C'est ce que nous chercherons à démontrer.

---

texte de l'appel:

NOUS REPONDONS A L' APPEL.BOUKOVSKY

Tous ceux qui en France ont eu connaissance du dossier rassemblé par Vladimir BOUKOVSKY, et publié sous le titre : "UNE NOUVELLE MALADIE MENTALE EN U.R.S.S. : L'OPPOSITION ", en ont ressenti la plus vive émotion.

La lettre qui sert d'introduction au livre déclare : "Au cours de ces dernières années, dans notre pays, plusieurs condamnations à des séjours dans des hôpitaux psychiatriques (y compris dans des hôpitaux de type spécial ) ont été prononcées contre des gens qui, de l'avis des membres de leur famille et de leurs proches, sont sains d'esprit. "

BOUKOVSKY demande aux psychiatres de prendre position sur ces internements et sur les "analyses psychiatriques" qui prétendent les justifier.

Cet appel nous atteint tous à des titres divers :

- Il touche chacun en ce qu'il s'agit là de la garantie de l'intégrité de la personne et de la liberté individuelle, inscrite ( fût-ce à titre purement formel) dans toutes les constitutions démocratiques, et qui ne saurait manquer sous le signe du socialisme sous peine d'enlever son sens à ce mot.

- Il touche en particulier les médecins qui ne peuvent considérer que comme un grave dévoiement, si ce n'est comme une véritable perversion, tout usage du savoir médical par un pouvoir politique à des fins non de soins mais de coercition, de sévices, voire de torture.

- Iltouche tous les travailleurs de la "santé mentale" qui, en conformité avec l'oeuvre de nombreux éléments progressistes (en particulier celle du Mouvement de Thérapeutique Institutionnel, créé dans la foulée de la Résistance), ont travaillé à une transformation du statut de la folie, des structures de soins et des appareils d'acceuil.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

- Il touche tous les travailleurs manuels et intellectuels, attachés au

CPYRGHT

devenir de la Révolution d'Octobre, qui savent que la cause de la gauche et du socialisme dans notre pays et dans le monde a tout à perdre en couvrant d'un silence -ce par un silence diplomatique- des abus aussi criants. Les crimes du stalinisme dénoncés par le rapport Kroutchev nous confirmeraient dans cette opinion si cela était nécessaire. Ce sont les exactions et les crimes commis au nom du socialisme, et non leur dénonciation, qui font le jeu de la bourgeoisie.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

POUR TOUTES CES RAISONS, NOUS REPONDONS A CET APPEL.

Tels qu'ils nous sont parvenus, les documents du dossier BOUKOVSKY ne permettent pas de conclure à l'irresponsabilité des sujets en cause; en revanche, ils dénoncent un traitement des internés qui n'a, avec la psychiatrie, qu'une ressemblance caricaturale.

L'huis-clos de fait du procès BOUKOVSKY, ainsi que sa brièveté, ne permet pas de croire que les autorités ont apporté un démenti quelconque aux affirmations du recueil.

EN CONSEQUENCE,

- conscients que le danger d'une utilisation répressive de la psychiatrie existe partout, et qu'on tolérer un seul cas où que ce soit compromettrait tout avenir;

- persuadés par ailleurs que l'ensemble de la psychiatrie soviétique ne saurait être impliquée dans des monstruosités policières;

les signataires appellent à la constitution d'une commission d'enquête internationale qui s'engage à oeuvrer sans relache afin de faire toute la lumière sur le contenu du dossier BOUKOVSKY.

---

S I G N A T A I R E S (I)

---

| | |
|---|---|
| ABITAN J. | Psychiatre |
| ALBARANES R. | " |
| ALPHANDARY M. | " |
| AJSCHENBAUM P. | " |
| AVRAM Claude | " |
| AVRAM Claire | Infirmière des hopitaux psychiatriques. |
| AZOULAY J. | Psychiatre des hopitaux. |
| AULAGNIER-CASTORIADIS Piera | Psychanalyste. |
| BAILLON G. | Médecin des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| BATAILLE L. | Psychanalyste |
| BENAYOUN Claude | Psychiatre. |

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

| | |
|---|---|
| BONNET M.F. | Infirmière des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| BORDES J. | médecin psychiatre |
| BOSSEUR CH. | Psychologue |
| BOUCHARD P.Y. | Médecin assistaux des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| BOUCHARD D. | Psychologue des hopitaux |
| BOUCRIS J. | Interne des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| BROUSSE C. | Psychomotricité |
| BUIN Y. | Médecin assistant des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| CARO GUY | Psychiatre |
| CASCADO D. | Psychothérapeute. |
| Champion F. | Psychiatre |
| CLASTRES G. | Psychanalyste |
| COUDERC | Psychomotricité |
| COURNUT J. | Psychiatre |
| CZERMAK M. | Psychiatre |
| DESCOMBEY J.P. | Psychiatre des hopitaux |
| DESCOMBEY F. | Psychiatre |
| DOLTO FRANCOISE | Psychanalyste |
| FELICIAN | [illegible] |
| FERRERI | Médecin des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| FERRERI J. | Interne des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| FERRERI M. | " " " " |
| FOURMANN B. | Psychologue |
| GAUBERT E. | Infirmière psychiatrique |
| GENTIS ROGER | Médecin des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| GEORGES Armelle | Psychiatre en formation |
| Georges Christian | Psychiatre |
| GONIS R. | Orthophoniste |
| GOTTEL M.H. | Psychologue |
| GINESTET - ELSAIR | Psychanalyste, |
| GRANGEON M. | Psychiatre des hopitaux |
| GUCHAN | Psychiatre |
| GRIBINSKY | " |
| HASSOUN J. | Psychanalyste |
| HOSSENLOPP M.P. | Psychologue |
| JANY J.C. | Interne des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| KARAVOKYROS | Médecin des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| KLOTZ L. | Psychiatre |
| KRIEF | Psychologue |
| LALAMME | Psychopédagogue |
| LAURET C. | Psychiatre |
| LEGRAND | Psychologue |
| LESTIENNE-HASSOUN P. | Psychologue |
| MARTIN J.P. | Interne des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| MEYER-BISCH | Psychiatre des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| MOREAU M. | INTERNE des hopitaux psychiatriques |

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 CPYRGHT

| | |
|---|---|
| MINIÈRE O. | Interne des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| MOSKOWICZ J.J. | Psychanalyste |
| MUSHART M. | Medecin psychiatre |
| MESSIER M. | Recherche C.S.M. I3è |
| METREAU C. | Psychiatre. |
| MEYER P. | Psychologue |
| NEUBUEGEN | Psychiatre |
| NOVORSQUI M. | Psychologue |
| PASCHE R. | Psychiatre |
| PEGUILLAN B. | Intenre des hopitaux de Psychiatriques |
| PENOT B. | Médecin psychiatre |
| POLLACK J.C. | Psychanalyste |
| POTHELET M. | Psychologue |
| PROUET C. | Interne des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| REDALLET | " " " " |
| ROLLENS | Médecin des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| ROTTERDAM D. | Psychiatre |
| SAISAULIEU | Psychiatre |
| SARADET | Psychanalyste |
| SEGAL C. | Psychologue |
| TOMKIEWIECZ S. | Psychiatre |
| TORRUBIA H. | Médecin des hopitaux psychiatriques |
| VALLEE R. | Psychopédagogue |
| VERGOBBI C. | Assistante sociale |
| WAKS O. | Psychiatre des hopitaux |
| WALCH E. | Assistante sociale |
| ZISSMANN H. | Psychanalyste |

SYNDICAT NATIONAL DES PSYCHIATRES EN FORMATION.
LOUZOUN Cl.

(I) ENVOYER SIGNATURES ET CORRESPONDANCE A :
DR. Claude AVRAM - 4 Rue des CISEAUX - PARIS 6è -

SOVIET ANALYST, London
22 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# Jewish Emigration

The arrival in the West as emigres of two distinguished Soviet intellectuals—the poet Joseph Brodsky and the mathematician and philiosopher Alexander Yesenin-Volpin—is a striking example of the current Soviet tactics in handling dissidents. In view of the unfavourable publicity arising from such cases as that of Sinyavsky and Daniel, the authorities are now operating in a piecemeal and variegated fashion, with the object of quietly eliminating the potential leaders and rallying points. There have been a number of unpublicised trials in the provinces, of Russian, Jewish and other dissidents, scattered in both time and space to avoid presenting a political target. (The expulsion of *The Times* correspondent, Mr David Bonavia, can be seen in this context as a means of cutting one of the major links in the chain of world knowledge of these matters—not only in itself, but as a means of discouraging other correspondents). At the same time, particularly over the past year, an unprecedentedly large number of Jewish intellectuals, including some of the most militant, have been allowed (or, in effect, sent) out; and this has been used not only in the case of Zionists proper, but with men like Brodsky whose Jewishness is no more than a technicality and who regard themselves as Russians.

This emigration of Soviet Jews has presented the Soviet authorities with an unprecedented propaganda problem. Although hardly anything appears about this in the Soviet press the country is seething with rumours. In the West we often hear well-founded complaints about Soviet un-

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

willingness to allow unrestricted emigration to Israel, but it should be appreciated that nothing even remotely similar to the present legalized exodus has ever occurred over the past 50 years (the only parallel is with the much smaller number of Germans allowed to leave the USSR in the period of the Nazi-Soviet pact). Exact figures have not been revealed by either side, but well over 10 thousand Jews have left the Soviet Union since January 1971. The impact of this upon other persecuted minorities can be imagined.

Recently the Soviet authorities have made their first attempt to explain it, in an interview granted to the weekly *Nedelya* by the deputy Minister of the Interior B. T. Shumilin (16.4.72). It was not a very successful effort. Shumilin began be explaining that, contrary to rumour, Jews had exactly the same right to leave the USSR as any other citizen, regardless of nationality, race, sex or age. This statement could hardly have had the desired effect.

Mr. Shumilin addressed himself next to the question: why would Soviet citizens, brought up under socialism, want to exchange it for capitalist Israel? He cited several factors by way of explanation: religious outlook, the desire to reunite with relatives, survivals of the past in people's minds, acquisitive property instincts and so forth. Unanswered, of course, are the questions involuntarily raised by Mr. Shumilin: why are survivals of the past so tenacious in the minds of the second and third post-revolutionary generations? And how can acquisitive property instincts still be so strong after 50 years of communist education?

Mr. Shumilin categorically denied the "fantastic rumours" that emigration to Israel had suddenly "acquired a mass character". Unfortunately his clarification could serve only to confirm these rumours. Shumilin stated that (a) only about 10 thousand Soviet Jews had gone to Israel in 1971, and (b) that anyway Soviet Jews represent only a tiny fraction of post-war immigration to Israel—this has achieved a total of 2 million, whereas only 21 thousand Soviet Jews had emigrated to Israel during all the years since 1945.

It will not have escaped the attention of most readers of *Nedelya* that the number of Jews allowed to emigrate in 1971 was thus equal to the total figure for the preceding 25 years. This is small in comparison with the number of Jews who would wish to emigrate if permitted, and it is accompanied by arbitrary arrests and police action on an important scale against Soviet Jews in general. All the same, a fair sized exodus *is* under way—by permission of the Soviet government.

There are manoeuvres hard to reduce to acceptable ideological terms. This is obviously proving to be one of them.

Meanwhile, as we said, the general campaign against the Jews continues. The Ukrainian press, attacking a Jewish professor of chemistry in Kiev, has described an appeal for the meeting at Babi Yar on the anniversary of the Nazi massacre of Jews as "this provocative call". The case of Valery Kukui (to which we referred in SOVIET ANALYST, No. 2) continues to have repercussions. His friend and representative Vladimir Markman complained to the authorities that his testimony at the Kukui trial was falsified and distorted. He has now himself been arrested and is in Sverdlovsk prison. Meanwhile, his family's telephone has been cut off; and the local newspaper has published an article accusing him of connection with Zionists who, it remarks, assisted the Nazis during the war. This last allegation is, of course, well established in Soviet mythology, almost to the extent of having earned the expression "as is known" (kak izvestno), traditionally applied in the Soviet Union to particularly improbable falsehoods.

NEW YORK TIMES
2 July 1972

CPYRGHT

# SOVIET DANCER SAID TO DESPAIR

## Panov, a Jew, Kept From Dancing and Emigrating

By ROBERT D. McFADDEN

Valery Panov, a leading Soviet dancer who was dismissed from Leningrad's Kirov Ballet Company in April after having applied to emigrate to Israel, has become a "desperate" and "deteriorating" man, according to a Western friend who had a private conversation with him in Leningrad last month.

Denied permission to leave Russia or to dance, even in class, and subjected to a variety of psychological pressures, including a recent 10-day jail term for "hooliganism," Mr. Panov, who is Jewish, indicated in the conversation that he could not indefinitely sustain himself physically and mentally.

[illegible] active since his dismissal from the Kirov on April 8, also indicated that he expected to be assigned soon to menial labor under Soviet laws against "parasitism." His refusal would result in at least one year's imprisonment.

Either choice—menial labor or prison—would, in the opinion of his closest associates, [illegible] the Soviet Union's most talented and highly decorated artists.

Details of Mr. Panov's condition and situation were communicated to the West in letters from his friend to Mrs. Patricia Barnes, the wife of Clive Barnes, The New York Times's drama and dance critic, and to others in the hope that the news would prompt appeals on [illegible] behalf from the

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

highest levels of the art world and government.

**No Letters Received**

Numerous petitions urging that Mr. Panov and his wife, Galya, be allowed to emigrate to Israel have circulated in the West, and hundreds of letters have been sent to Mr. Panov himself.

In the letter to Mrs. Barnes, Mr. Panov's friend said that the dancer told of receiving none of the letters. Mr. Panov, unable to communicate with anyone in the West himself, urged his friend to make it known that he hoped the United Nations Commission on Human Rights would contact him so that he might explain "the details of his illegal expulsion from the ballet and recent arrest."

The Kirov has made numerous tours abroad, but Mr. Panov has not been allowed to accompany the group, or leave the country for any reason, since 1960, when he made one performance at Madison Square Garden. After that performance, he was abruptly and inexplicably summondd home. Since then he won wide critical and popular acclaim and a number of official awards, including the title of Honored Artist of the Soviet Union.

Last March 21- he applied for character references from his ballet union to support an application for emigration to Israel, where he has relatives. In response, the union accused him of being a traitor to the Soviet Union and dismissed him. His wife, also a prominent Kirov dancer, was also dismissed from the company, though she has since been reinstated as the group's lowest-paid member of the corps de ballet member.

While word of Mr. Panov's subsequent arrest hand imprisonment for 10 davs had reached the West, the dancer's version —as told to his friend—had not been publicly detailed.

**"Malevolent Message"**

The arrest occurred on May 26, according to the friend's letter. After being summoned, questioned and released by police officials that day, Mr. Panov was halted on the street by two militiamen, one of whom accused him falsely of spitting on his sleeve.

Mr. Panov said he was arrested on a charge of "holliganism," held for three days without food in a crowded, bedless, bug-infested cell, then sentenced by a woman judge and confined for seven more days in a cell "filled with amputees, cripples, invalids with crutches, etc."

"As a dancer, he understood this malevolent message." the friend wrote. He lost 11 pounds in the 10-day term, he said, and emerged with his head shaved and his face "very pale and lined."

"Panov is desperate about his situation," the friend said. "Unlike a writer or a painter, a doctor or a mathematician, he is a physical man whose art and being are tied up in his use of his body. This is now closed to him, his body is deteriorating, he feels that he cannot simply be patient as he is advised."

Mr. Panov also indicated, according to the friend, that "the psychological pressures of his present state were such that he could not sustain them indefinitely." During the conversation, Mr. Panov "rarely smiled, and then only briefly and ironically—it was a grim contrast with his brilliant smile as Harlequin [in the old "Harlequinade Pas de Deux"] flooding his face from the sheer joy of his dancing," the friend wrote, adding:

"The great dancer, the most highly decorated artist of the Soviet Union ever to ask to leave, is being transformed into a desperate, cornered animal."

THE ECONOMIST
17 June 1972

# It isn't only Jews Russia is letting go now

CPYRGHT

The Russians are starting to let some of their non-Jewish dissidents leave the Soviet Union, as well as Jews who want to go to Israel. This major new development seems to have had its experimental origin some time back, in 1966, when the Soviet authorities took the unprecedented step of allowing Valeri Tarsis—a writer, and one of the most outspoken critics of the Soviet regime—to leave the country. Although his visa was good for only three months, neither Mr Tarsis nor his government had entertained any notion that he would return to a country which he had openly branded as "fascist." Within three days of his arrival in London, he was stripped of his Soviet citizenship and declared a traitor, and mentally ill to boot. Mr Tarsis asked for political asylum, and then settled down to a quiet life on the shore of Lake Geneva. In retrospect, that decision seems to have been a test case.

Soon after Mr Tarsis's departure the brilliant Soviet mathematician, philosopher and poet, Alexander Yesenin-Volpin, told a western correspondent that when he had asked for an exit visa he was hauled away to a lunatic asylum. Now, however, the situation has altered. Taking advantage of the increased exodus of Jews from Russia, a number of political dissidents whose links with the zionist movement are tenuous at best (a few have Jewish or half-Jewish wives) have asked for and received permission to leave the country. A few of them have settled in Israel. Others have opted for western Europe or the United States. Within the past two months Rome has become one of the centres of the new Russian emigration. Among the recent arrivals are Yuri Shtein, a film director and one of the members of the group for the defence of civil rights in the Soviet Union that was organised in 1968. Another is the writer and linguist Yuri Glazov, who was thrown out of his job four years ago after signing a number of protests against judicial malpractices in Russia. The deeply religious painter Yuri Titov is yet another.

And on June 9th the group was joined by its most illustrious recruit yet—Alexander Yesenin-Volpin, released at last after his previous failure to get out. In a crowded Roman restaurant, surrounded by happy, shining faces, Mr Volpin declaimed some of the revolutionary verse he had written in a Soviet prison back in 1949, and dedicated himself, along with his enthusiastic friends, to the furtherance of the struggle for human rights in the Soviet Union.

The significance of what seems to be the formation of a foreign outpost of the Russian democratic movement is not yet clear. The Soviet government may have borrowed a leaf from the tsars as well as from Lenin, who permitted his ideological adversaries to leave Russia, but it is far from extending this policy to all anti-regime intellectuals who are ready to apply for exit visas. Nor should it be assumed

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

that the majority of Russia's dissidents wish to emigrate. By and large, those who have come out, or would like to, feel that their effectiveness inside the country has been virtually destroyed as a result of continuous repression and harassment. But their energies have not been sapped, nor do they wish to sink into obscurity, as Mr Tarsis did.

Within the past few weeks, for instance, they have engaged in a campaign on behalf of the 40-year-old writer Vladimir Maximov, the author of a remarkable novel, "The Seven Days of Creation," published by a Russian emigré journal in Germany, and soon to appear in a number of translations in Europe, the United States and Asia. In poor health, and under threat of official reprisals, Mr Maximov has now had his cause taken up—as a result of the efforts of his friends in Rome—by a number of distinguished Italian writers, including Ignazio Silone, Elena Croce and Giancarlo Vigorelli. Last week, when some of Yuri Titov's paintings arrived from Russia, most of them irreparably damaged by sulphuric acid, the group issued a statement which denounced this as an act of political vandalism. Plans are also afoot to publish a series of books and possibly a magazine that would keep western public opinion informed of the struggle for human rights in the Soviet Union.

What impact will the departure of some of the leading dissidents have on their friends and colleagues in Russia? Clearly the Soviet authorities look forward not only to the eventual fading of news about Mr Volpin and his group but also to the demoralising effect of their departure on the dwindling ranks of the dissident communities in Moscow and Leningrad. But Mr Volpin has no such fears. "The growth of public opinion in Russia," he said in Rome last Saturday, "cannot be stopped: for every single individual leaving the Soviet Union, two new ones will come up. Our friends know that we had no choice but to leave and that we shall continue our struggle as vigorously outside as we did inside the Soviet Union."

Although a few of the other recent arrivals concede that their departure has caused dismay among some of the remaining dissidents, the chances are that Mr Volpin's prediction will prove to be right. The struggle in the Soviet Union is nurtured by forces stronger than the leadership provided by a few individuals. Lenin's activities in London and Geneva 60 years ago did not bring about the downfall of the tsarist regime, but often proved invaluable to his comrades at home. What with modern communications, an increasingly alert western public opinion, and a marked sensitivity to it on the part of the Soviet regime, the role of individuals such as Mr Volpin is bound to grow. In the end Mr Brezhnev may well find his newest tactic of "getting rid of the troublemakers" more of a mistake than a blessing.

PEACE NEWS, London
23 June 1972

CPYRGHT

# RUSSIAN DISSENTER APPEALS TO THE WEST

The Russian Jewish film director Yury Shtein has called on western public opinion to resist the current campaign to suppress the "Democratic Movement" in the Soviet Union. In a statement just released he describes the present terror situation of arrests and house-searches, and stresses his belief that western protests play an important role in restraining the Soviet secret police from more drastic measures.

Mr Shtein was recently allowed to leave the USSR and is now in Rome. Prior to his departure he was one of five Soviet dissenters to sign a defiant letter to *The Times* (March 9). He belongs to the "Action Group for the Defence of Human Rights in the Soviet Union," which was formed three years ago. Its first appeal to the United Nations was published in *The Observer* in June 1969. The group's informal leader is Mr Pyotr Yakir, whose memoirs about the years 1937-42 have just been published in Russian by Macmillan. Of the group's 15 members five are at present in labour camps or "mental hospitals," a further two having recently been released.

Mr Shtein's statement reads as follows:

"Whoever is not indifferent to internal political developments in Russia today will certainly have noticed that the start of the current year has been marked by most disturbing events.

"On January 5 Vladimir Bukovsky was sentenced to 12 years of imprisonment and exile. Then a wave of arrests and house-searches began in various big cities: Lvov, Kiev, Leningrad, Vilnius, Sverdlovsk, Moscow . . . Among those arrested are well-known activists of the Ukrainian national-democratic movement, Ivan Svitlychny and Vyacheslav Chornovil, the Sverdlovsk teacher Anatoly Reshetnik, the Lithuanian historian Vatslav Sevruk, and the Moscow scientist Kronid Lyubarsky. Also arrested [illegible] members of the Action Group, the Kiev mathematician Leonid Plyushch, a man of remarkable modesty and dedication to others. Flat-searches have struck popular cultural figures like the writer Victor Nekrasov and the critic Ivan Dzyuba. And for the first time people came to search the flat of historian Pyotr Yakir, a prisoner for many years of Stalin's concentration camps. A fabricated criminal case has been opened against Yakir, and his arrest could occur any day.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

that the intimidatory actions of January signalled the start of a big new campaign of repression. Various forms of persecution are continuing unabated. Especially disturbing are recent reports of the even bigger series of flat-searches conducted in Moscow on May 6.

"It appears that, behind the veil of the currently proclaimed line of reducing international tension, the authorities have decided to put an end to all energetic expressions of free thought and to suppress the so-called Democratic Movement, a movement whose only aim is the defence—within the framework of Soviet legality—of human rights, of rights guaranteed by the relevant articles of the Soviet constitution. This last point is one to which I would like to draw the particular attention of western public opinion.

"It is also extremely important for citizens of the west to understand the atmosphere of massive dis-information which now reigns in Russia, and the constant attempts to crush at birth any expression of even moderately free and living thoughts. To understand that this deliberate policy of the authorities kills hope in the hearts of people who are trying to observe decent moral values, and also swells the ranks of the irresponsible intelligentsia, infecting them once again with the humiliating and dangerous psychology of spiritual slavery. To understand and to help! Yes, to help. I am not in any way calling for a cold war, let alone a hot one, nor even for any official interference in particular aspects of Soviet internal politics. But I am absolutely convinced that the voice of world public opinion has great significance today as regards defending the rights of Russia's 'dissenters', and not only in defending their rights, but, even more important, in preserving their lives.

"A few words of history. The human rights movement arose in the Soviet Union as an inevitable reaction to the long years of Stalinist tyranny, as a natural striving of the healthy part of society for spiritual emancipation. The people who were resolute enough to proclaim their beliefs openly, and who also defended the persecuted, knew of the dangers which threatened them and did not count on support from the west. Neither Yury Galanskov, nor General Grigorenko, nor Andrei Amalrik appealed to the west. And for their 'subversiveness' the protesters paid with various sorts of repression.

"But, despite everything, *samizdat* [typewritten manuscripts] continued to expand, and the *Chronicle of Current Events* went from strength to strength.

"The determination of the dissenters produced a certain disarray in the Soviet punitive organs, who were not accustomed to struggling against an open opponent. Every court-case, especially in the capital, became an embarrassingly scandalous event. And here an important role was undoubtedly played by the protests which reached us from abroad. The support of foreign friends was clearly felt through all those years, thanks especially to the broadcasts of Radio Liberty, which we were recently amazed and disturbed to hear might be closed down.

"At present, it seems, a certain decline can be observed in our Democratic Movement. There are various reasons for this, an important one being that many of its members have simply, in a normal human way, grown tired. The decline is undoubtedly temporary: the genie can no longer be put back in the bottle. But the oppressors are logical: it is precisely now that they have decided to show their teeth.

"Times have changed, and the decaying regime will not now dare to launch mass arrests. But the life and freedom of the least submissive people is seriously threatened. Only a decisive and broadly based protest from world public opinion can stay the uncertain hand of the oppressors.

"Nor must it be forgotten that many of the noblest people in Russia continue to languish in prisons. The life of some of them is in serious danger. The 65-year-old General Grigorenko is dying, literally dying, in solitary confinement in Chernyakhovsk. Also in a dangerous condition are inmates of other mental hospitals: Victor Fainberg, Vladimir Borisov, Vladimir Gershuni. In the Potma camps Silva Zalmanson, sentenced to 10 years, is going blind. The intolerable living conditions of the prisoners, coupled with repeated hunger strikes of protest, have reduced many inmates of the Mordovian political camps to a condition of serious malunutrition.

"All these facts are known. They go unnoticed only by the perpetrators of the tyranny. Until these people are reminded of them.

"Like the thief whose hat burns brightly on his head, they fear any exposure of their crimes. But simultaneously they have a vital interest in the preservation of international ties. If the west had been resolute enough in 1968 to declare a complete cultural boycott of the Soviet Union at the right moment, these people would hardly have dared to occupy Czechoslovakia.

"We were always delighted, and morally supported, by the protests which reached us from abroad, by the student demonstrations in defence of Grigorenko, Bukovsky, Gorbanevskaya, Reiza Palatnik and the victims of the anti-semitic trial of the 'aeroplane hijackers' . . . And so now, when we see that the forces of reaction are not just perpetrating occasional excesses, but trying to launch a new offensive in my country, the burden of mutual responsibility lies on all people of good will. For, as the recent past has shown, the triumph of evil never remains isolated in one area, but contains an insidious danger for the peace and tranquillity of all the inhabitants of our single 'planet of people'."

CPYRGHT
WASHINGTON POST
9 July 1972
CPYRGHT

# *Intrigue Enlivens Conference in Kiev*

KIEV, July 8—An unusual international scientific meeting, enlivened by political intrigue, and an apparent case of abduction by the Soviet secret police, ended here over the weekend.

The meeting was the ninth Congress of the International Association of Gerontology and organization that embraces all the arts and sciences concerned with the progress and results of aging, from microbiology to social work.

More than 3,000 delegates from 40-odd countries, the largest contingent from America, took part in the congress for a variety of reasons. Many, especially Americans, were only vaguely interested in the subject matter, but took advantage of the congress to get a tax-deductible trip to the Soviet Union for themselves—and an unusual holiday for their wives and children.

One scientist who had an intimate connection with the scientific work of the congress was not allowed to attend. He is Zhores Medvedev, a Soviet geneticist with an international reputation both as a scientist and as an author of books published only in the West detailing cases of arbitrary Soviet behavoir toward scientists and in human rights cases.

Medvedev was invited to lecture at the congress by its in-

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

ternational [illegible] tee. Soviet organizers dropped his lecture, without authorization from the international committee, but Medvedev—who was once held briefly in a Soviet mental hospital until protests by scientists got him released — decided to attend anyway.

He came to Kiev last weekend and saw several old friends and personal acquaintances. These scientists had the impresison that Medvedev planned to stay here during the week of the congress to talk with colleagues. But once the meeting began, he disappeared. Friends, especially American scientists, began to worry about him.

One friend received a telegram signed "Medvedev" which said, "the press of work" in his institute near Moscow [illegible] appear at the conference. But since he had already appeared in Kiev, his friends thought it was unlikely that Medvedev had written this telegram.

At mid-week, Medvedev's friends received a second telegram which alarmed them further. It said he could not attend a congress symposium because of "earlier arrangements with Profes. R. Kidnapper." This was read here as meaning that Medvedev had been kidnapped by a professional.

Dr. Bernard Strehler of the University of Southern California reached Medvedev by telephone at his home outside Moscow. Medvedev told him that six men had detained him in Kiev, bundled him into a car and sent him back to Mos[illegible] him with breaking the law if he returned.

This news provoked extensive consultation among many Western scientists. They finally decided that Dr. Leonard Hayflick of Stanford University would call on Dmitri F. Chebotarev, the Soviet scientist who organized the congress and who is president-elect of the International Society of Gerontology.

Hayflick asked Chebotarev what had happened to Medvedev. He said he did not know. Hayflick then asked for assurances that no official action would be taken against Medvedev. The Russian offered to do everything he could to prevent anything from happening.

This satisfied the angry scientists, though they reserv[illegible] protest later. Soviet officials of the congress were reportedly relieved to avoid an international incident, though they were unhappy that Western correspondents in Kiev got news of the Medvedev case to the outside world.

At the closing session of the congress, two reporters asked Chebotarev about Medvedev. "He is at home," Chebotarev said. Then he hurried off refusing to answer any questions.

At the conference, nearly 1,000 papers were read to various meetings. Soviet scientists and officials participated in almost every session, and some of their reports provided interesting insights.

For example, three scientists from the Soviet Academy of Medical Science reported

THE ECONOMIST
8 July 1972

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT

*Russia*

# In the dark ages of psychiatry

FROM A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT
*Jerusalem*

The Soviet practice of incarcerating political nonconformists in mental asylums has acquired considerable notoriety over the past few years. As a result of the reports appearing regularly in the clandestine Russian periodical Chronicle of Current Events, and of the information supplied by the young Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky, recently sentenced by a Soviet court to a total of 12 years' imprisonment and exile, the western world has been able to learn a good deal about this technique of political repression. Now this knowledge has been confirmed and amplified by a new source—the Soviet émigrés in Israel. Dr Norman B. Hirt, an eminent Canadian psychiatrist, has just spent a year in Jerusalem, interviewing many former "patients" as well as a few former Soviet psychiatrists.

Some of the most chilling pages in the book Dr Hirt plans to publish on the subject will deal with the director of all diagnoses connected with political cases at the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry in Moscow—the man in charge of the whole system of psychiatric treatment of "socially dangerous" people in Russia, Daniel Lunts. According to Dr Hirt's informants (all of whom were interviewed independently and without each other's knowledge), Dr Lunts—described as a professor of psychiatry, but a KGB colonel—is a man in his fifties, of medium height, whose connections with the secret police eventually led to his being given the job of supervising all the political psychiatric cases in Russia, of whom there are many thousands, according to Dr Hirt's informants. He is said to have told patients that "when I say a man is schizophrenic, he is schizophrenic, just as if I say an ashtray is schizophrenic, it is schizophrenic." Witnesses claim that he has stripped women patients and stuck pins in their breasts, ostensibly to determine their "hypersensitivity" and thus their "pathological characteristics."

This man is responsible for perfecting a system whereby virtually every Soviet citizen who has ever undergone any psychiatric examination may find himself pronounced neurotic or psychotic on the flimsiest grounds. To be sure, only a small proportion of Soviet psychiatric patients are branded "psychotic." Indeed, it must be borne in mind that alongside the forensic psychiatric system dominated by Dr Lunts and the KGB there is a much larger system of ethically run and well organised clinics, dispensaries and hospital wards, staffed by men who abhor the Lunts methods.

Yet so pervasive is the power of the KGB that it may at any time decide to arrest a political dissident, merely on the basis of former illnesses, and to confine him either for observation in a psychiatric clinic or, after a bogus trial, to an indefinite term in one of the notorious "special psychiatric hospitals." It is Dr Lunts who has built up the techniques of mock "medical investigations" and who is most frequently responsible for the forced medical "treatment" of people against the wishes of their relatives, despite contrary evidence adduced by lawyers and acquaintances and even regardless

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

of other medi[illegible] sulphazin—[illegible] the necessary evidence, and protests against injustices are no longer a novelty in Russia. The psychiatrist looked at me for a few seconds, and then exclaimed: "Would a western psychiatrist ever dare to come out openly against his professor?" A melancholy answer, but perhaps, given the stalinist power exercised by Dr Lunts and the KGB, an understandable one. Dr Hirt says that such answers strengthen his determination to expose a man who, together "with the powers that be, is setting us back to the dark ages of psychiatry. If my medical colleagues remain silent they will in effect be condoning one of the greatest medical criminals of the century next to Dr Mengele of Nazi Germany."

The medical treatment, it is made clear by the evidence amassed by Dr Hirt, is a form of punishment. The use—or excessive use—of certain antidepressants, tranquillisers and narcosynthetic chemicals (so-called "truth serums") is a case in point. The drugs include aminazin which, when used in excess, produces debilitating aftereffects such as athetosis—a violent lack of control of muscular movements—severe skin reactions, the destruction of the memory system, and the complete exhaustive collapse of the victim; reserpine, which has been used in such quantities that post-mortems have shown severe destruction of the protein structure of the victims' brain substrates; and sulfozin—a 1 per cent oil base which, according to Dr Hirt, "is never employed in ethical practice" but which is liberally used by the KGB.

Other punishments testified to by Dr Hirt's informants include beatings and the use of the "dry pack"—a wet canvas in which the patient is rolled from head to foot, and which causes the most agonising pains as it begins to dry and contract. The Serbsky Institute is also reported to have a cage, one metre square, for patients who have been given an overdose of drugs that cause muscular spasms.

I asked one former Soviet psychiatrist, whom I interviewed together with Dr Hirt, why neither he nor his colleagues in the Soviet Union have seen fit to denounce Dr Lunts and his

NATIONAL REVIEW
9 June 1972

CPYRGHT

THE BUKOVSKY PAPERS

# Notes from Soviet Asylums...

## 1. 'Thank You, Party . . .'

Valeriya Novodvorskaya is nineteen years old. Two years ago she finished school with distinction and entered the French department of the Moscow Institute of Foreign Languages. She has written three books of poems, none published.

On December 5, 1969 Valeriya bought a ticket to the opera *Oktyabr* (October), produced in the Kremlin Convention Palace. Before the performance began she started to distribute leaflets:

*Thank you, Party*
*For our bitterness and despair,*
*For our foul silence,*
*Thank you, Party*

*Thank you, Party*
*For the weight of doomed truth,*
*And for the shots of coming battles,*
*Thank you, Party*

The girl made no attempt to hide. She passed out leaflets until the secret police led her away. At the Serbskiy Institute for Forensic Psychiatry, the "doctors" found her insane: "schizophrenia with a paranoid development of character." The only symptom cited was the strong emotion she showed when forced to answer the psychiatrists' questions.

Valeriya was not called to, or even informed of, her trial, held March 16. The prosecutor equated her actions with the act of the would-be assassin who had recently fired a shot at Brezhnev near the Borovitsky Gate. The sentence was "forcible treatment"; Valeriya is now confined in the Special Psychiatric Hospital at Kazan.

## II. The SPH

Young Valeriya was in good company: Among the Soviet citizens now or until recently confined to mental hospitals are the geneticist Zhores Medvedev, who attacked Lysenkoism; the religious artist and restorer of churches Yuriy Titov, who protested the detention without trial of Jews; the hero of World War II P. G. Grigorenko, who urged withdrawal of Russian troops from Czechoslovakia; the civil libertarian Vladimir Bukovsky, who was first incarcerated in 1963 for having copies of Milovan Djilas' *The New Class* in his possession.

"Special Psychiatric Hospitals" are operated by the secret police (KGB), for "compulsory treatment" under strict surveillance. The "patient" usually first visits the Serbskiy Institute, which, according to the *Report of the First U.S. Mission on Mental Health to the USSR* (published in 1969



Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and quoted *in extenso* by I. F. Stone in the February 10, 1972 *New York Review of Books*), is the "most prestigious examining institution" in the Soviet Union. From the first, a prison atmosphere is evident. According to the *Report*: "It is an old building with an entrance barred by forbidding iron gates. These gates, which slide electrically along tracks to admit visitors, are part of a very tight security system, which includes the use of soldiers as guards. . . . Such elaborate precautions, it was explained, were necessary because the Serbskiy examines some of the most difficult cases in the Soviet Union." ("It is a pity," Stone growls, "no one asked whether soldiers were often called in for consultation.")

After examination at the Serbskiy (which can last as long as three or four months), the "patient" goes to one of seven SPHs in Kazan, Leningrad, Sychyovka, Chernyakhovsk, Minsk, Dnepropetrovsk and Orel, or to a "Special Psychiatric Sanatorium" in Poltava or Kiev. (Fifteen general psychiatric institutions, moreover, have special isolation wards in which dissidents are often imprisoned.)

Opinion in the West has been aroused by a stream of reports on the Soviet practice of confining perfectly normal people in psychiatric hospitals, to silence their religious, political or social dissent. In March 1971 the Paris-based International Committee for the Defense of Human Rights made public a series of documents collected by Bukovsky. (The case history above and the protests that follow are excerpted from the Bukovsky Papers.) Since then, psychiatrists and laymen all over the free world have joined the campaign. Resolutions have been adopted by the Vancouver and Canadian Psychiatric Associations. Scientists and public figures in Belgium have delivered letters of protest to the Soviet Minister of Health; at the behest of psychiatrists, the Swiss television service has aired a special program on the Soviet incarceration policies. The World Federation for Mental Health, meeting in Hong Kong last year, added its voice. Amnesty International has interested itself in the matter.

THE WORLDWIDE protest movement met with a serious setback last December, at the Congress of the World Psychiatric Association in Mexico City. The Congress received two messages from the Soviet Union. One, signed by the nuclear physicist Andrei Sakharov and three other scientists, urged that the Congress look into "the complex of questions concerning the rights of people ruled to be mentally ill." Although avoiding specific reference to the Soviet Union, the signers remarked: "It should not be forgotten that such abuses can be practiced as a means of political persecution."

The other message appeared in an open letter to the *Times* (London) from Bukovsky, who has spent nine of his 29 years in prisons or mental hospitals. Bukovsky sent thorough documentation, including copies of psychiatrists' diagnoses of six dissidents committed to mental hospitals. He asked: "Do the above-mentioned diagnoses contain enough scientifically based evidence not only to indicate the mental illness described in the diagnoses but also to indicate the necessity of isolating these people completely from society?" Forty four British psychiatrists replied that the diagnoses appeared to have been "made purely in consequence of actions in which they were exercising fundamental freedoms," and joined Bukovsky in urging that the matter be brought before the Congress in Mexico City.

In his opening address, Dr. Ramon de la Fuente, President of the Congress and President-elect of the Mexican Academy of Medicine, alluded to the question of political incarceration. "To keep silent about such an ignominious situation," he said, "would weigh heavily upon our conscience." But the Congress kept silent—even after a pamphlet detailing the British psychiatrists' findings was distributed, even after the Soviet Human Rights Committee (a dissident group) released an appeal on the eve of the meeting, describing the role of the leader of the Russian delegation in the Medvedev case.

That worthy, Dr. Andrei V. Snezhnevsky, led his delegation out of the hall as soon as a demand was made that the Congress oppose commitment of political dissenters to mental institutions. The alleged reason for the walkout was the lack of an official interpretation into Russian. Dr. Snezhnevsky told a reporter the appeals were "a maneuver of the cold war, carried out at the hands of experts." So much for the Mexico City Congress.

## III. All the Vices . . .

*According to a recent Associated Press dispatch from Moscow, "hundreds of mentally healthy workers, students, artists and intellectuals" are in SPHs "for disagreement with official doctrine." One of them, Viktor Fainberg, who protested the invasion of Czechoslovakia, writes to the West from the Leningrad SPH on Arsenalnaya Street:*

"I am appealing from an institution in which all vices inherent in a system of arbitrariness and violence over human beings are present, perhaps in the most concentrated form. An institution in which all forms of mockery are blended, beginning with the crudest up to the most refined and sophisticated, from deprivation of freedom for an indefinite time up to beatings, torture and murder. From an institution whose very existence is illegal from the point of view of both law and morality.

"I am appealing over the heads of 'competent' legal and administrative agencies of my country, because all my appeals addressed to them remained, and could only have remained, unanswered. Finally I am appealing to you because the citizens of my country who have also appealed to you regarding unlawful arrests and other violations of human rights have been sent here, to these torture chambers.

"Vladimir Borisov is here. He has been declared insane on account of his convictions. His only crime is that he appealed against the illegal arrest of General Grigorenko and others. (Grigorenko is detained in another psychiatric prison called Chernyakhovsk, where conditions are many times worse than in ours.) . . .

"There is a contradiction between existing legislation regarding forcible treatment and the legal practice. The very court verdict (formulated usually as: "case dismissed – to

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

be released from custody [and sent to forcible medical treatment"] is itself contradictory because in the hospitals of this special variety patients and political inmates are kept under custody and are subject to the same, if not to greater, restrictions than in regular prisons.

"The above verdict is unlawful because under Soviet law 'forcible medical treatment cannot be decreed for more than two years,' while the average time of detention in a special hospital is from four to five years. Many remain there seven to nine years and in some cases ten years and more. . . .

"As soon as a political prisoner arrives in the special hospital he is given a choice: either face perpetual prison or repudiate his convictions. The female manager of the eleventh section declared in straightforward fashion: 'Your ailment is your dissident way of thinking.' . . .

"The doctors declare: 'We cure you with walls' [i.e., incarceration]. Sometimes the doctors warn the political prisoner that should he 'remain stubborn' the next commission could prescribe 'treatment' other than 'walls.' Thus, a perfectly healthy person is threatened with 'treatments' by very powerful drugs which can destroy even his psyche, subjecting the inmate to the most refined torture.

"The staff can with complete impunity forbid interviews with relatives, as well as letters from home, without notifying the correspondents. You can imagine the anxiety of the relatives and the emotional experience of the prisoners who think that their relatives have rejected them!

" 'Discipline' is maintained by an atmosphere of intimidation. Beatings are normal occurrences. After beatings come another kind of physical coercion, the prescription of powerful injections for 'disciplinary infringements.' Injections of sulphasine are used almost exclusively for punishment. This results in a temperature rise (to 104°F) and in pain at any movement for about three days. Five injections at two-day intervals are sometimes prescribed!

"There is the '*ukrutka*' [tying-up] or '*teplovlazhnoe ukutyvanie*' [warm-damp wrapping], when the patient is wrapped up in wet bedsheets, and not simply tied to the cot, but tightly wrapped with plaited fabric. The linen dries and squeezes the body like a vise (often the patient loses consciousness) and the screams of the tortured can be heard all over the ward. There have been cases when such a tying-up has been ordered for ten consecutive days!

"I hope that among the readers of this letter there will be many who have enough civic courage to protest against the very existence of penitentiary hospitals, against the shameful misuse of psychiatry and detention; brave enough to demand an immediate investigation of crimes committed here and the punishment of the guilty ones."

## IV. The Grigorenko Case

*On March 7, 1969, ex-Major General Pyotr Grigoryevich Grigorenko of the Red Army circulated an appeal to Soviet citizens, calling upon "all Soviet people, without doing anything rash or hasty, and by all legal methods, to bring about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and the renunciation of interference in her internal affairs." Two months later, on May 7, in Tashkent, Grigorenko was arrested for taking part in a demonstration in support of the Crimean Tartars. He was charged with "slandering" the USSR and its social system. On October 30, 1969, Grigorenko was committed to a mental hospital for observation. On December 12, his family reported that Grigorenko had been found "insane," suffering from a "paranoid development of his personality," and had been remanded to the SPH at Chernyakhovsk for treatment, where he is still confined.*

*Following is part of a letter on the Grigorenko case from mathematician Essenin Volpin to the novelist Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn.*

"There are, after all, cases when having arrested a normal person and being unable to sentence him properly, they send him to a mental hospital by court order. In a mental hospital they can then keep a person forever. All the means of psychiatric pressure and contemporary medicine can be turned to attempt a complete transformation of character.

"Little is demanded of the patient. He has simply to agree with the correctness of the court order which sent him for forcible treatment and promise not to take part, in the future, in actions which have led up to this.

"What would such an admission mean to Grigorenko? No more, no less than the admission of insanity at the time he wrote his letters in defense of the persecuted Crimean Tartars: and also the admission of the deliberate falsity of their contents, and of all he was fighting for. Such an admission is unthinkable on the part of a man of Grigorenko's integrity and courage. But this is not all. Grigorenko's admission would mean a de facto assent to the court sentences against which he protested, because his own case was in spirit similar to that of the Tartars' whom he intended to defend.

THE LIKELY consequence would be an extension of the treatment for half a year. And so until one side capitulates, Grigorenko, by virtue of his honesty and courage, will be forced to doom himself to perpetual internment in this hospital. Even the expiration of the maximum penal term for his offense (seven years) will not help him in any way.

"This attempt—to obtain a false confession at any cost from a human being—I would call without hesitation an attempt at spiritual murder.

"One can often hear discussions about the justification of 'lying for salvation.' Is it justifiable to wring out such a lie by threats of an indefinitely long, perhaps a life-long incarceration, combined with numerous burdens, deprivations and dangers? Is it possible to regard as mentally inferior those who are able to withstand such pressures for an unlimited time?

"As for promises to change one's behavior given under such a threat, they can have no value either legally or morally. Moreover, an agreement to give such a promise can have for an honest man a most important significance—that of a complete moral collapse. No matter how one looks at this problem, it is clear that this is another attempt at spiritual murder.

"I say 'attempt,' because I know the man that Grigorenko is.

". . . Add it all up: lack of legal guarantees, uncertainty about the length of the term, pathological surroundings, fear

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

of unknown drugs, isolation and the impossibility to do even such work as would be possible under these conditions. Imagine that you have been put in the same place and that only one thing is demanded of you--a sincere admission of the fact that they have dealt with you justly. Only having imagined all this can one begin to understand what forcible treatment is. . . ."

## V. Plea from a Little Fish

*V. I. Chernyshov writes from an SPH:*

"Having been buried it is hard to prove that you're alive —except perhaps if a miracle should happen and someone dug up your grave before you died for good. It is hard to prove one's soundness of mind from within the walls of a psychiatric hospital.

"I finished the mechanic-mathematic course at LSU [Leningrad State University], then worked as an instructor of math with the title of assistant in the Leningrad branch of the Moscow Institute [of technology]. I got carried away with collecting books and records, wrote poems for myself, short stories and philosophical essays. I typed up all my writings and bound them in three notebooks: poems and aphorisms, short stories and abstract dissertations, philosophical essays and statements of my ideas, of an anti-Communist nature. During my five years of writing philosophical studies I gave them to only two people. In March of 1970 I was arrested for 'anti-Soviet propaganda.' One of the readers of my writings repented at once and was given his freedom. The other, a graduate of the Art Academy, V. Popov, whose guilt was in having drawn a bookplate in my notebook, was arrested.

"In prison I was examined for thirty minutes and a diagnosis was reached: chronic schizophrenia of a paranoid type. I didn't see a lawyer, was not present at the trial and wasn't even told of the diagnosis or about the trial for a month and a half. My wife told me about it during a visit after the trial. The same diagnosis was reached for Popov.

"What can the psychiatrists say to society to prove my insanity? And it is interesting—will society say anything about me? Will those who have been my ideals of honesty and courage—the writer Solzhenitsyn and academician Sakharov– say something?

"In America Angela Davis was arrested. The whole world up to now knows about her fate, she has lawyers, people protest in her favor. But I, I have no rights, not once did I meet a lawyer, I wasn't present at the trial, I have no right to complain, I have no right to go on a hunger strike. I myself have seen how in psychiatric hospitals they tie protesting political prisoners, who refuse to take food or 'medicine,' give them a shot after which they cannot move, and forcibly feed and 'treat' them. A man called V. Borisov has protested for the past two years--they treat him with aminasin, which results in a loss of individuality, his intellect gets blunt, his emotions are destroyed and his memory disappears. This is the death of creativity: Those who are given aminasin cannot even read afterward.

"Even though I am afraid of death, let them rather shoot me. How vile, how repulsive is the thought that they will defile, crush my soul! Imagine, that they put in prison an innocent, pure young girl and told her: 'Wait. Soon they'll come to rape you.' What would she feel? But they will defile her body, and me, my soul.

"I appeal to believers. N. I. Broslavsky, a Christian, has languished here for over 25 years. And Timonin, whose guilt consists solely of having poured ink in a voting urn. They jeer at Timonin's religious feelings, they demand that he repudiate his faith, otherwise they won't let him out. Christians! Your brothers in Christ are suffering. Stand up for their souls! Christians! Do not allow them to give a healthy man drugs that will destroy his soul.

"It is impossible to disprove that I'm insane, because nobody ever proved or will try to prove that I am insane. The Communists have invented mighty means of reprisal against people who think differently. They give various chemicals to political prisoners with the aim of repressing the psyche and destroying the intellect. Statistics are gloomy—political prisoners are, on the average, kept in confinement longer than murderers and rapists. I have met murderers who are here for the third time. That means that to free a murderer is not as dangerous as freeing a man with a different opinion.

"Political prisoners, committed to psychiatric hospitals, are robbed of all rights, and are placed among lunatics and murderers; and . . . they can be kept here forever. There is one, here since 1952. And another, N. I. Broslavsky, as I already said, has been here for 25 years and four months. A member of the demonstration of August 1968, Fainberg, is kept in isolation.

". . . If they shot Gumilev—a great poet—if they kept in prison Vavilov—an academician and world-renowned scientist—then a quiver of the lashes of the KGB's eye is enough to make me, Chernyshov, who is neither great nor famous, vanish without trace. . . .

"I am afraid of death, but I'll accept it. I'm terribly afraid of torture. But there is a worse torture, and it awaits me—the introduction of chemicals into my mind. The vivisectors of the twentieth century will not hesitate to seize my soul; maybe I will remain alive, but after this I won't be able to write even one poem, I won't be able to think. I have already been informed of the decision for my 'treatment.' Farewell!"

*(Note: The "treatment" of Popov, about whom Chernyshov writes in his appeal, has already started. The diagnosis is the same: chronic schizophrenia of paranoid type. The doctor suggested that his wife draw up official documents about her husband's disability, adding that Popov will have to get reclassified because after the "treatment" he won't be able to work as an architect.)*

## VI. A Word from Comrade Solzhenitysn

"This is how we live: without an arrest warrant or any medical reasons four policemen and two doctors arrive at a healthy man's home. The doctors declare him insane, the police major shouts: 'We are the AGENCY OF VIOLENCE! Get up!'; they twist his hands and drive him to a mental hospital.

"This can happen tomorrow to any one of us; it did happen to Zhores Medvedev—a scientist-geneticist, a publicist

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

with a flexible, precise, brilliant intellect and a good heart (I personally know of his disinterested help to unknown ill and dying men). It is in fact because of the diversity of his talents that he was charged with insanity: 'split personality'! It is in fact his sensitivity to injustice that was mental deviation: "poor adaptation to the social environment"!

"It is about time to realize: the commitment of free-thinking people to psychiatric hospitals is spiritual murder, it is another version of the gas chamber, but even more cruel: The sufferings of those being killed are more painful and more prolonged."

SOVIET ANALYST, London
Vol. I, No. 5
27 April 1972

CPYRGHT

# The Kremlin v Solzhenitsyn

Some four weeks ago, after a long period during which the Soviet press studiously refrained from even mentioning the name of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a concentrated propaganda onslaught was mounted against the great writer, simultaneously in the USSR and the "people's democracies". The main attack was directed against Solzhenitsyn's *August 1914*, the Russian text of which was published last year in the West. Literary critics have analysed the book's shortcomings, fellow-writers have accused Solzhenitsyn of betraying not only the cause of Socialism but Holy Russia herself, and, inevitably, representatives of Soviet toilers – of the workers, peasants and toiling intelligentsia – have expressed their indignation in letters to the press. To make the whole affair seem even stranger, none of Solzhenitsyn's Soviet traducers make any pretence of having read the book in question.

**The Attack**

On the face of it, there would appear to be close resemblance between this latest literary denunciatory campaign and the hounding of Boris Pasternak in 1958 – after he, too, had received the Nobel Prize for a book *(Doctor Zhivago)* which likewise remained unpublished in the USSR. Yet the points of difference between the two cases are even more striking. The latest instalment in the Solzhenitsyn story serves to illustrate both the essential continuity of Soviet cultural policy and the changes that have taken place in Russia over the past 15 years.

The anti-Pasternak campaign was initiated by the publication in *Literaturnya Gazeta* (25 Oct. 1958) of a long, reasoned and by Soviet standards fairly reasonable close analysis of *Doctor Zhivago*. It had been sent for publication together with a covering letter from the editorial board of *Novy Mir* – including such eminent "liberal" writers as Alexander Tvardovsky and Valentin Ovechkin – in which they expressed their "indignation and contempt" for "Pasternak's shameful anti-patriotic attitude". The attack was continued in numerous articles and writers' meetings with practically all the leading lights of Soviet literature associating themselves with the condemnation of Pasternak. Under this pressure Pasternak was forced to renounce the Nobel Prize and to beg forgiveness of his colleagues and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Today the situation is markedly different. The onslaught on Solzhenitsyn was launched neither by a prominent Soviet writer nor an important Soviet periodical but by an unknown Polish journalist writing in an obscure provincial paper. His article was reprinted in *Trud*, the Soviet trade union paper, and the writers who have joined in the chorus of condemnation are completely unknown. No reputable Soviet writer – not even Sholokhov – was ready to lend his name to an open vilification of the man generally recognised as the greatest Russian writer of our time.

The article which started off the present campaign, by Jerzy Romanowski, appeared originally in the Polish Catholic weekly *Wroclawski Tygodnik Katolicki* (26 March, 1972). *WKT* is published by the notorious Piasecki, a former Polish fascist who has served the communists since 1945 and who is head of the collaborationist "Catholic" organisation PAX (unrecognised by the Catholic Church). Romanowski writes in a blatantly chauvinistic "Parislavic" vein: exactly the approach required by the Soviet authorities. The aim of their present campaign is to undermine Solzhenitsyn's immense authority and popularity by branding him not simply as an over-zealous critic of Stalinism (which would only enhance his popularity) or even of the Soviet system (which would cut little ice with many readers) – but as an embittered denigrator of Russia and of the Russian people, and an admirer of Russia's traditional enemies.

It is probably a shrewd decision. The implementation, however, presents grave difficulties. Solzhenitsyn is distinguished among present-day Soviet writers for the intensity of his feelings towards Russia, his admiration and compassion for the ordinary people of his country. His dislike of Communism (for that is the only truthful way to describe his attitude) stems precisely from his conviction that Communism has inflicted incalculable damage upon Russia and inhuman suffering

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

upon the Russian people. Solzhenitsyn's love of his country is sufficiently widely known in the USSR for any but the most disreputable Stalinist hack to attempt to gainsay it – a self-defeating exercise. The task was, therefore, entrusted to a "foreigner"; his criticism of Solzhenitsyn's "anti-patriotic" writings would, it was thought, sound more convincing.

**The Charges**

*August 1914* describes the events leading to the annihilation of General Samsonov's army at Tannenberg (East Prussia). Since the book does not contain a trace of anti-Russian denigration Romanowski has to apply methods of sleight-of-hand. The exercise is performed quite skilfully and with a show of objectivity – Romanowski gives quotations in full, with references to the page numbers of the Paris Russian language edition – but is easily exposed upon comparison with the actual text of *August 1914*. Which, of course, is what Soviet readers cannot do.

Romanowski uses three basic methods of "criticism". One is fairly straightforward: the complaint that Solzhenitsyn depicts the Germans not only as enemies but also as intelligent men and good fighters, while Russian soldiers are endowed with deplorable human frailties, such as astonished admiration for the neatness and prosperity of East Prussian towns, presenting such a contrast to their poverty-stricken homeland (Solzhenitsyn describes this on the basis of his own experience, 30 years later, when he entered East Prussia at the head of his artillery battery). In other words, Solzhenitsyn persists in departing from the simplified black and white image incumbent upon practitioners of "Soviet realism".

Another method of falsification is the attribution to Solzhenitsyn himself of sentiments expressed by the characters in his novel. Thus Solzhenitsyn describes the mystical desire of the Prussian generals to take their belated revenge for the defeat of the Teutonic Knights at the hands of the Slavs in 1410 at Tannenberg – and Romanowski expresses shock at the thought that a Russian writer could sink so low as to subscribe to views held by German militarists and even by Hitler.

Finally, Solzhenitsyn is accused of distorting the picture of the Russian war-effort by ignoring certain basic historical facts – facts which, unbeknown to the Soviet reader, actually occupy a conspicuous place in his novel. Romanowski cannot deny that Solzhenitsyn's narrative is correct in all essentials, and that Samsonov's army *was* destroyed at Tannenberg. But – he adds – unfortunate though this may have been for Russia, it played a decisive part in the greater European war by diverting crucial German forces from the West and making possible the French victory on the Marne. The clear implication is that Solzhenitsyn deliberately disregards a great achievement of Russian arms. This is the approach of the Soviet military historians, who [illegible] Korotyntsev, disgraced for castigating the Commander-in-Chief, Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaievich, to his face: "The fatal decision was taken when we wanted to please the French and rashly promised them to begin operations on the 15th day of mobilization . . . Under the convention Russia had promised 'firm assistance' but not suicide. It was *you* who signed Russia's suicide for her, Your Excellency!" Throughout his book Solzhenitsyn is protesting against the betrayal of Russia's national interests by the Tsarist government, which, in deference to its allies, wantonly sacrificed Russia's armies and led the country to defeat. Solzhenitsyn's reading of history may or may not be correct, but the absurdity of accusing him of anti-patriotic and anti-Russian feelings should be evident to any reader of *August 1914*.

Such are the flimsy foundations for the latest Soviet attack on Solzhenitsyn. To date its success, as noted above, has been negligible. The Soviet public is prevented from reading Solzhenitsyn's novel but it will certainly have taken note of the deafening silence of all the big guns of the literary and cultural establishment.

**The Reasons**

Why have the Soviet authorities suddenly decided to open up their propaganda barrage? There seems little doubt that this was done because of two events that caused them acute embarassment: the proposed delivery of the Nobel Prize to Solzhenitsyn in Moscow, and the interview he gave to two American correspondents. The interview took place on March 30, the prize was to be delivered on April 8. And in between the two dates the Soviet government unexpectedly denied an entry visa to Dr. Gierow, the Secretary of the Swedish Academy, who was to deliver the prize.

The Western press, not unnaturally, concluded that the Swedish representative was barred as a consequence of the Solzhenitsyn interview. It appears now that there may have been a weightier consideration. At a conference of the Executive Committee of PEN International held in London on the 19-20 April (and unreported in the press) Heinrich Boell, the President of PEN, reported on his meeting with Solzhenitsyn in Moscow last March. Herr Boell had suggested to Solzhenitsyn that PEN send a representative to the Nobel Prize award ceremony, and Solzhenitsyn gladly agreed. The representative Herr Boell had in mind was none other than Graham Greene. Mr. Greene (according to the Boell account) readily accepted the invitation. This placed the Soviet authorities in a painful dilemma. They could not refuse a visa to Graham Greene, one of the Soviet public's favourite authors, with a great official reputation as a "fighter for peace". Much simpler to prevent the ceremony from taking place. Hence the denial of Dr. Gierow's entry visa.

Solzhenitsyn's interview with the correspon-

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

*Post* reports that [illegible] in conjunction with the Boell visit and the planned Nobel Prize ceremony, it represents a remarkable change in the writer's attitude to Western opinion. For nearly ten years, since the publication of *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* and his instant emergence to international fame, Solzhenitsyn has consistently avoided any meetings with foreigners. Until nearly a month ago not one Western journalist had ever spoken to him. The air of mystery surrounding Solzhenitsyn gave rise to a spate of rumours and to damaging publicity by self-styled "friends" (see SOVIET ANALYST Vol. 1, No. 2). Now, all at once, Solzhenitsyn has reversed his previous policy. Why?

The overwhelming likelihood is that Solzhenitsyn [illegible] dents' book: the more publicity, the stronger the contacts with Westerners – the greater his security and the weaker the government's chances of imposing a gag. Solzhenitsyn has thrown down an open challenge to the Soviet government, a challenge which the Kremlin cannot afford to ignore. It looks very much like unconcealed warfare between the writer and his government. The outcome is anybody's guess. For all its colossal power there is very little that the Soviet government can do to Solzhenitsyn, short of arresting him and thus calling forth an unprecedented international storm of protest. They can hardly hope to achieve much by their renewed and so far singularly ineffective propaganda-offensive.

SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, London
14 May 1972

CPYRGHT

# RUSSIANS AGAINST THE KREMLIN
## Who Fights For What

TODAY *The Sunday Telegraph* launches a series of articles which will probe at least one part of that enigma which is Communist Russia. The subject is protest—the concourse of all those currents of agitation and discontent which are beginning to break through even the iron-hard crust of the Soviet police State.

This rumbling is heard in many quarters. Individual Russian poets, novelists, scientists and artists agitate for greater freedom of expression, and as often as not pay the price for their temerity with terms in labour camps or so-called medical rehabilitation centres. From time to time evidence of strong religious ferment and nationalist protest comes through as well, but so far it has been hard to get anything like a complete picture of the extent and strength of dissent.

Who are these "Russians against the Kremlin"? How did the various protest movements — nationalist, religious, racial and intellectual—start? How are they related to each other? What is their present force, and can they hope to grow? Why has the régime given ground as much as it has, and can it afford to retreat any further? Above all, what prospects of change does all this ferment hold out for the Soviet system itself? Is what we are witnessing just the controlled modification of a hitherto rigid one-party dictatorship; or is it something that could eventually dissolve the very dictatorship itself?

These are some of the questions which this series of articles will examine in depth in the light of the latest evidence.

★

Such issues are not remote from British interests. Soviet influence has already extended westwards to embrace more than 100 million Europeans. Next year is likely to see the convocation of a European security conference at which the Russians will seek to have their rôle as a European Power confirmed. By then Britain will have joined the West European community. We shall be much closer to Russia, and the Russians will be closer to us.

It would be dangerously naïve to interpret these various protest movements as heralding the dawn of some Western-style parliamentary democracy on the vast grey horizon of Soviet Communism. What we are dealing with is mostly demands, made either by groups or individuals, to achieve some specific freedom within the present framework of Soviet society.

Even where the demands become general rather than specific — the plea to be allowed to worship freely, for example, or the campaign of the liberal intellectuals for "Communism with a human face"—these demands, as things stand at present, are also couched within the broadly accepted context of the system which has now existed in the Soviet Union for more than two generations.

It is conceivable that some of these broader freedoms are, in the long run, irreconcilable with Communism. It is also conceivable that some of the protestors are becoming aware of this. But they do not at present say so.

★

Russia is too vast, too complex and still too closed a society for any

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

inquiry to be able to claim that it is "revealing all." But this newspaper has nevertheless been able to tap a variety of sources of up-to-date information.

We have talked to many people, young and old, who have recently arrived in the West from Russia and whose impressions are fresh. We have spoken to Russians, Latvians, Georgians, Armenians; to Greek Orthodox, Catholics and Baptists; to former peasants from remote villages and to intellectuals who, until a few weeks ago, lived in Moscow and the major cities. We have spoken to Marxists and anti-Marxists, to Christians and agnostics.

We have studied and drawn upon the vast ever-growing library now available in the West of *samizdat*, the underground leaflets and news sheets prepared and circulated inside the Soviet Union and smuggled through to the outside world.

Finally, to have the latest possible information and impressions we have spoken directly to leaders of the civil rights movement still living at liberty in Moscow.

One of our most important sources of fresh and first-hand material on life in the Soviet Union has been the steady stream of Russian Jews who have clamoured for, and finally obtained, permission to emigrate to Israel. These are protestors who found a means of ending their sufferings by leaving the Soviet Union, not changing it.

The Kremlin's motives for letting some go but not others cannot be clearly defined. But whatever the reasons behind this great new exodus into the Promised Land, it remains the most spectacular triumph to date of Russians against the Kremlin.

It is with this long, bitterly-fought and still continuing saga of the Russian Jews that our inquiry begins.

# Flight into Israel : Victory for protest : Behind the new Jewish exodus a movement even the Soviets could not stop

CPYRGHT

THE road from the Soviet Union to Zion winds through Vienna. Every morning just after seven o'clock five coaches of the Chopin Express from Moscow roll into the Ostbahnhof, and two score more Jews, women, sleepy children and old men who have dreamed dreams in distant Soviet Republics, stir and realise that at last they are out of the Soviet Union.

*"Baruch haschem, jazana mimisraim le cheruth, baruch haschem."*

"God be praised; we have passed out of Egypt into freedom. God be praised." These were the first words from the 3,000-year-old sacred text uttered in Hebrew this spring on the station platform by Rabbi Derhabshvili, spiritual leader of the 70,000 strong Jewish community in Georgia.

His joyous outburst and his personal story symbolise the great outpouring from Russia to the promised land. The Rabbi was one of those who signed the famous Georgian Letter. This plea for help in emigrating to Israel went to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in August, 1969. Now all the 18 who signed it are in Israel.

As the tired Jews emerge from the train into early morning light a business-like Israeli diplomat—Herr Direktor from the Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 multilingual, moves in to collect the passports with their precious visa of exit.

*"Shalom, shalom.* Do not worry, all is well," he says.

For these Jews the flight into Israel has begun and the hammer and sickle are left behind with their Soviet possessions. Since the end of the Six Days' War in 1967, when Soviet Jews began in earnest their agitation to leave, 26,193 have joined in this great new exodus towards their national homeland. Thousands still wait for the liberating exit permits, and almost every month now brings more Jews home to Israel. In March 2,500 made the journey and in April 3,000.

They bring with them a fund of information about everyday life and suffering in the Soviet Union. Why has the Kremlin, with its traditional love of secrecy in domestic affairs and its harsh controls over emigration, allowed them to leave?

To a great extent, it is the Soviet Jews themselves who have forced the hand of their Russian masters through noisy and continuous agitation inside the country and skilful world-wide propaganda for their cause outside. And the spark which kindled all this agitation and propaganda came from the brilliant military victory which Israel won during the Six Days' War.

A Russian Jewess who recently arrived in Vienna put it in these words: "When we realised that there were Jews who were fighting a great battle and winning it, something came over us all, wherever we were living in the Soviet Union. We had almost forgotten we were Jews. Now we wanted to be with the others and fight and work with them. It was not just a feeling. It was an epidemic."

Before the Six Days' War only 5,000 Jews had been able to leave the Communist East. It was Khruschev who authorised the first few to move out after his 1966 announcement that "the humanitarian re-uniting of families" was official Soviet policy. This was all very well for Khruschev's image abroad. But it was not enough for the Jews in Russia who had experienced the near-extinction of their culture.

Though their few synagogues were full, the Jews had a constant battle against bureaucratic anti-Semitism in their efforts to launch Jewish theatres, newspapers and books. It was also out of the question for them to open schools and train rabbis. Many Jews with whom we spoke claimed that there was job discrimination against them and that even the cleverest students often lost the struggle for high-powered appointments.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

It is for these reasons that so many Jews from [illegible] decided that they must abandon Russia and its despotic régime. And of course, for the Zionists with a dream, Jerusalem itself is the goal.

The flow of emigrants ceased after the war, when the Soviet Union cut off relations with Israel. Jews in the Russian empire, partly because they feared action against themselves, partly because they were moved and excited by the victories of their kinsmen in the field, began their great agitation.

One way in which the Jews pricked into the hide of the Kremlin and its Soviet bureaucracy was through the *samizdat*. This is a unique Russian institution—it means "self publishing"—of political chain-letters printed and distributed secretly to defeat the rigid censorship. These bulletins, letters and brochures on political themes are as close as you can get within the Soviet system to a free Press—in clandestinity.

Since 1966 it has been a criminal offence with a penalty of up to three years' imprisonment to take part in underground literary activity. Despite this, the publishing trade goes on throughout the Soviet Union, and the documents also have a wide circulation abroad after they have been smuggled out. A register compiled in the West contains the titles of over 1,000 papers touching on dozens of themes.

From 1968 onwards the Jewish agitation made its weight felt through these papers. "Letter from 26 Lithuanian Jews on rising anti-semitism"; "Appeal from a group of Riga Jewish students after the attempted self-immolation of Ilya Rips"; "Open letter from 27 Latvian Jews asking permission to emigrate to Israel"; "Letter of nine Leningrad Jews to U.N. Human Rights Commission"; "Letter from 15 Minsk Jews to Israel Premier Golda Meir"; "Letter from 84 Riga Jews to U.N. General Assembly seeking support to emigrate to Israel"—the list goes on for pages, each Russian Jewish appeal is another loud pounding on the doors of world opinion and Soviet obduracy.

Stronger acts of personal courage from the Jewish community, estimated at over three million, did even more to rock the Soviet system from 1970 onwards. The Jews adapted Western methods, by introducing civil disobedience, sit-ins, protest meetings, hunger strikes and renunciation of Soviet citizenship. Many went to prison for their defiance of the formidable K.G.B. security police.

These movements coincided with the efforts of Soviet intellectuals who had nothing to do with Zion to band together in embryo democratic movements of dissidence. Soviet citizens working to get a few crumbs of freedom found their struggle overlapped with that of Jews looking towards Jerusalem.

In fact, the Jews made such a nuisance of themselves that the Soviet [illegible] decided in 1968 to let some people go, with the obvious aim of skimming the cream off the Jewish Zionist movement. Every month a hundred or so were allowed to go to Israel. And this process continued until December, 1970, the date of the Leningrad skyjack trial, when the Moscow Government tried to break the Jewish movement by classic repressive measures.

They arrested 11 people and charged them with planning to hijack an Aeroflot plane. Nine of them were Jews who hoped to escape to Sweden and then to Israel. All were convicted, but the Russian court commuted the death sentence on two Jews and reduced the prison camp sentences on others, probably because the case had aroused such strong feeling in the outside world.

If the Kremlin had hoped to crush the Jewish movement by staging the Leningrad show trial it failed. Jews within the Soviet Union redoubled their efforts to get away, and world opinion, which worries the Soviet leadership, had its effect.

A Baltic Jew who recently passed through Vienna claims that one stage of the great break-through came on March 9, 1971. On that day he arrived in Moscow with a group of 150 of his fellow Jews, "determined to risk all." They sat down in the entrance hall of the Supreme Soviet building and demanded to see the Minister of Interior about going to Israel. He was one of a delegation of six who were finally admitted to the presence and he described how, after a tense argument lasting many hours, the Minister promised them travel papers. It had been touch and go; now it was Israel not Siberia.

World pressure and determined agitation from within Russia cannot be the whole explanation of the Government's decision to give in—however reluctantly and erratically. After all, the Kremlin has often ignored world opinion and has always so far crushed agitation. It seems that the political security argument prevailed.

The Jews were becoming, after 1967, a direct threat to stability throughout the country. One large community of 70,000 Georgian Jews posed a special problem. Well established for nearly 3,000 years in this now Soviet Republic between the Black Sea and the Caspian, they are completely integrated with the local population. Nonetheless they were determined to break out and join their co-religionists in Israel. Whether or not they were really a threat, the Soviet authorities showed that they were ready to allow very many Georgian Jews to leave.

Many individual Jews, not part of a regional community, have proved a much graver problem. These are the people who flourished in literary, artistic and scientific circles [illegible] other major cities.

Groups or individuals, they were all trouble-makers of a peculiarly persistent kind. If Israel wanted them so much and they yearned so much to go there, why not let them out, provided that the whole process could be controlled?

Last year the party hierarchy decided to let more Jews leave and from March onwards 1,000 a month got their exit visas. This year, unless there is yet another change in policy, the Ministry of Absorption which looks after the Jews arriving in Israel expects to receive between 30,000 and 40,000. This is a sizeable number when it is remembered that emigration from the United States to Israel runs at about 10,000 a year and from Britain at 1,200.

The road to Zion is still not an easy one for Soviet Jews. They are still persecuted, most lose their jobs the moment they apply for a visa to leave, some go to the labour camps, and many are still denied the magic piece of paper.

Many of the Jews who want to leave are from the cream of Soviet society—there are among them respected and prosperous Academicians, Lenin prize-winners in science and the arts, musicians and civil servants. Their cases attract attention. Very often publicity and pressure from the Western world embarrass the Kremlin and squeeze out exit visas for the Jewish elite.

Such people produce a strong emotive reaction in Israel itself. For at the turn of the century it was similar people in Eastern Europe who re-created the Zionist movement which led to the installation of the now powerful Jewish State in the Middle East. As a senior Israeli diplomat put it—"Do not forget that our Mayflower came from Russia."

## *All their worldly goods*

The founding fathers from the East have left their stamp on the way of life which has developed in

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Israel. Russian remains a powerful language there, and many of the original Communist revolutionaries who overthrew the Tsarist régime were Jews for whom the revolution was to herald the new Jerusalem.

But there are also thousands if not millions of ordinary Jews, including those who escaped the great Nazi holocaust, who are now washed up in the Baltic States and the Ukraine. Another, smaller group of Eastern Jews inhabit Georgia and the central Asian republics which were incorporated into the Russian Empire by the Tsars.

It was Jews of this kind whom we watched emerging from the Chopin Express in Vienna. They were good simple people, many of them peasants from Georgia, assembling their regulation Soviet cardboard suitcases, mums and dads with children and grandparents.

When you have travelled for 36 hours through Poland and Czechoslavakia and you have all your worldly goods with you it is natural that there should be anxiety about them. A stout old Georgian lady argues with a porter who is trying to put her things, which include an ancient sewing machine and a television set, on to a luggage truck. Others in the group have plastic bags with cooking utensils and strange brown paper parcels.

## *Swamped by new arrivals*

Eventually the straggle of Jews from the East moves off to a Viennese breakfast. They go 30 miles by bus to a transit camp at Schönau, a pleasant little village.

The castle at Schönau is a sprawling, low-roofed building—half English country-house and half Austrian shooting-lodge in style—set in a secluded park with its own small lake. In the 'Eighties and 'Nineties of the last century, it was a Hapsburg *Lustschloss*, a castle of pleasure belonging to the Archduke Otto, who was perhaps the gayest and most abandoned of all the archdukes of his time.

Today, as the main registration and sorting centre in Austria for Russian Jews in transit to Israel, it is still well screened. On some days new arrivals swamp it, and are to be accommodated in the village, or in hotels on the Semmering Pass, an hour's drive away to the south. The Jewish Agency officials who run Schönau in smooth and discreet co-operation with the Austrian authorities are clearly expecting this flood to swell over the coming months.

The morning's intake from the Chopin Express when we visited the castle were mostly Georgian Jews, the men wearing their distinctive white felt caps. There was more bewilderment about them than joy or excitement. Indeed, they moved around in what could only be described as a dignified daze. Those who were not being documented inside the castle itself were quietly sorting out and re-packing their possessions to be loaded into the belly of the Jumbo jet which was to take them on that night to Israel.

Until a few months ago, the emigrants came across the border with much more. Indeed, in the early days of the exodus one Russian Jew arrived with 20 Soviet motor-cycles to launch him on his new career. Jewish furriers from the Baltic States used to cross into Austria with piles of nutria pelts and other precious furs.

In recent months there has been a clamp-down. Household items, usually well-worn, are carefully checked. One Russian Jewess from the Ukraine who arrived in Austria this spring had the fur collar torn off her coat by the Soviet Customs officials at the frontier.

Despite this, quite an assortment of personal property continues to arrive at Schönau with the emigrants. Items that do not get stuffed into cardboard packing boxes find their way to the Kaufhaus Bachtrog in the village. This little general store, the only one in Schönau, is the emigrants' barter centre, the place where the newly arrived Russian Jews come to buy and sell as soon as their papers have been arranged and they are allowed through the park gates for a stroll.

What the Russian Jews usually want are new clothes—a nylon shirt or a pullover or a pair of "latest fashion" shoes, anything to make them look a little smarter and a little more Western for arrival in their new homeland. What they offer (apart from roubles, which can now be changed at a rate of one rouble for nearly six Austrian shillings) are Soviet cameras, watches and caviare.

## *Screening by the Israelis*

The first phase at Schönau [illegible] gives the Israelis the opportunity of carrying out a quick screening operation to discover who is who and to find out whether there are those who wanted to leave the Soviet Union more than to carry on to Israel. Only a handful opt for the United States or Britain, and they go to Rome to await visas of entry. The Israeli agencies do not talk much about those who decide against going to Israel.

According to official statistics nine per cent. of immigrants to Israel from all countries decided not to stay after the first year. But of the Soviet Jews who arrive there only one per thousand returns to the Soviet Union. But they admit that in 1971 there were 50 Jews who came no further than Vienna.

Until the train comes into Vienna nobody quite knows what its cargo will be. Officials at the frontier discreetly count the numbers, usually 30 or 40, who may be Jews from the Soviet Union, and pass on the information to the Israeli reception committee. There is an air of quiet clandestinity over the whole operation. Technically the Jews arrive without entry permits and should not be allowed to stay in Austria, but the Government has mastered its fear of offending the Russians and tolerates a brief stay.

The big Boeings leave Vienna at midnight, and before dawn the Soviet Jews are listening to spoken Hebrew for the first time and being marshalled either into temporary absorption centres or to an *ulpan* where they learn their new ancient language and start looking for jobs.

Few have much cash when they arrive. The Jews have had to sell their possessions to pay for their visas and the fares. One Georgian told us that in Kutaisi, Georgia's second city, "the Christians are making money out of our houses because they know we have to sell at a low price." In Georgia they automatically call all non-Jews Christians.

At the gloomy and now overworked central visa office in downtown Moscow, where thousands of Jews and foreigners have waited patiently in line over the years, a stiff payment has had to be made—500 roubles (about £225) for turning one's back on Soviet citizenship, and 360 roubles (£163) for the visa. This visa office is called in Russian *Ovir*. Because so many Soviet Jews gather there it is jokingly known now as "Tel-Ovir," to echo the name of Israel's principal city Tel Aviv.

Another hurdle has had to be cleared at the Russian Customs at either Moscow airport or at [illegible] on the Russian border. Here Russian bureaucracy makes its final presence felt and the rulebook is thrown at the emigrants, still afraid and uncertain.

Some Georgian Jews safe in Israel complained bitterly that Soviet Customs officials had stolen from them their rings and other valuables. It is a fact, however, that normal Russian Customs regulations allow only one engagement ring, one ring with a precious stone, one pair of earrings and not more than 400 grammes of silver ornaments to be taken out of the country. There are no exceptions for Jewish emigrants.

On the plane from Vienna the Jews who have come there by train are joined by the grander ones who had enough money to travel by air from Moscow and quite often there is a little party of friends at the airport to wish them good luck. Their arrival is expected, for friends in Israel have telephoned them and exchanged information. Similar telephone calls go out from London and New York so that the Jewish agency can be well informed about the state of the exodus and of those under arrest.

It is one of the paradoxes of life in the Soviet police State that, despite the real fear of K.G.B. methods, telephone tapping and bugging, it remains possible for Russian Jews to talk about themselves over the telephone to the outside world and also to hear news of those who have gone before. Operation Exodus is made easier by the fact that it is now possible to dial calls directly from the West to Moscow and other large cities. Technology helps penetration of the Iron Curtain.

The other great channel of news is Radio Israel, beamed at the Soviet Union with programmes about Israel. It is thought that the Russians do not jam this service because the radio tactfully avoids reports on world political events, and because if Radio Israel was jammed Israel would jam Soviet broadcasts to the Middle East.

It would be a fallacy to think that the departure of so many Jews and their families from the Soviet Union is a sort of high summer of relaxation by the Soviet authorities. The files of Jewish agencies in the West show that for every one application approved there is one turned down.

True, Georgian Jews can go, or can wait their turn for the Soviet bureaucracy to approve their exit visas. Jews from Riga, the Lithuanian capital, are also by and large on the approved list. And it is far easier for Jews living in big cities to state their case than for those in smaller places.

How many Jews are there in

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

the Soviet Union? A full census report published in 1962-63 in Moscow showed that 2,267,814 citizens were registered as Jews, and that this made them the 11th largest national group in the U.S.S.R. Arie L. Eliav, a former Israeli Minister and an expert on the subject of Jews in the Soviet Union, estimates that the true total now is more than a million higher than this. Mr. Eliav was himself born in the Soviet Union, like many of Israel's civil servants.

Some Jews from Russia now in Israel admit that they were in fact expelled. In a Hebrew language training centre on the Jerusalem road to Bethlehem we met a 24-year-old student from Odessa, called Stephan Averbakh, rugged and bearded, who specialised in physical training and Hebrew philosophy.

"They kicked me out," he explained. "I wanted to come to Israel but in fact the police came around and simply said, 'We do not want you here—you have five days to leave'."

His parents are still in Odessa and have no desire to leave, but he wanted to reach Israel for strictly Zionist religious reasons rather than for political ones.

To go to Israel you need faith in Zion. The choice for Soviet Jews is either to stay in Russia and fight or to emigrate to a country where for most people life is hard, where you have to learn a new language, and to a nation which lives with the imminent threat of a new war with the Arabs.

If the floodgates were really lifted, how many Jews would go to Israel? A million, say the optimistic in Jerusalem. But the only realistic figure is that calculated from the number of Soviet Jews who get papers proving that they have relatives already there.

Last Wednesday an Israeli Cabinet Minister sounded a warning note. The Soviet authorities, he said were drastically tightening their exit visa policy. If they continued to do so, this would leave around 80,000 ungranted requests by the end of 1972.

SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, London
21 May 1972

CPYRGHT

## RUSSIANS AGAINST THE KREMLIN-2
## The Price They Pay For Protest

THE flight of the thousands, the Jews from the Soviet Empire into the land of Israel, is one of the most significant events of the 'Seventies. In the context of Soviet history it marked the opening of prison gates to an intellectual elite as well as to ordinary people. No other group of such a size has been given this liberty. For Israel this period will certainly go down as the decade of the Russian Jews.

The present *aliyah* or wave of immigrants is not so much a mass escape from persecution as a breaking out towards something which the Jews believe in. Their Communist God has failed and they seek the true Jehovah. They who as a group have long been active among the Russians against the Kremlin now find themselves uniquely liberated. But the road has been hard, and many thousands of their fellows are left behind, endlessly obstructed by the system they reject.

The obstacles which Soviet bureaucracy puts in the way of Jews wishing to emigrate are so many and so complex that it is a wonder any Jew ever succeeds in making an application, let alone in leaving the country. Questioned at a Press conference in Paris in 1966 to say what hope there was for Jewish families divided by the cold war between Russia and the West to be reunited, the Soviet Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin declared:

"If any families want to meet together or want to leave the Soviet Union, the road is open for them and there is no problem here at all."

The reality is very different from the "open road" Kosygin talked of. Soviet officials are fond of declaring that Jews enjoy the same rights to emigrate as all other Soviet citizens. This is true: the ordinary Soviet citizen has no right at all to emigrate.

The only grounds on which a Soviet Jew may apply for emigration are that he wishes to be reunited with members of his family. So the first thing a would-be emigrant has to do is to track down his relatives abroad and obtain an affidavit from them that they want him and his family to join them. Fortunately Jewish families are large and often widely scattered, and many Soviet Jews know where their relatives are.

If they don't, they have to perform the near-impossible task (in Soviet conditions) of sending their own particulars abroad and initiating a search for relatives of whom they may not have heard for decades and who probably have given them up for dead.

Few Jews would have been successful in receiving their invitations to Israel if it were not for the enterprise and collaboration of the Israeli authorities. It is seldom that they fail to track down some relative, however distant, who is ready to help.

But this is still not enough. Before his application can be accepted by O.V.I.R., the office issuing visas, the would-be emigrant needs three references from his place of employment—from his immediate superior, from the trade union secretary and from the Communist party man.

The snag here is that none of these officials is under any legal obligation to provide a reference. Indeed, it is their duty to discourage a person from emigrating, which to the Communist mind is an act of treachery. This impasse can be overcome only by personal persuasion or the use of influence or bribery.

To these purely technical obstacles is added a campaign of harassment. Once he has made his application and it is known that he wants to leave, the Jew is dismissed from his job or at least reduced in rank. He is dragged in front of office or workshop meetings and denounced as a traitor. He is spurned by the "loyal" Soviet citizens among whom he lives. His children are subjected to the same procedure at school or college.

## *Jews need strong nerves in Russia*

It requires very strong nerves indeed for a family voluntarily to submit themselves to such treatment. They can rely only on the support and sympathy of other Jews, though it must be said in fairness that a section of the Russian population has refused to join in this cruel game. There have been cases where Russian employees have spoken up in favour of their Jewish colleagues and have refused to vote for their dismissal.

Even when the Jewish emigrant has fought his way through the red tape—a process which may easily take a year or more and has probably cost him all his money—and has faced up to the harassment, he still has no guarantee that he will leave Russia. Some families have waited for years. Others have met with a flat refusal.

Among the reasons or excuses offered for refusing permission to emigrate are: that the person is of military age and capable of serving in the Israeli Army; that the situation in the Middle East is unsettled; that the applicant has technical or scientific qualifications that the Soviet State cannot spare; that he has had recent access to secret information.

This latter reason is given for refusing to allow, for example, a group of 14 Jewish scientists from Moscow to leave

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

for Israel, even though they long ago ceased to be engaged on anything that could be called secret—a very wide classification in Russia.

It is clear that they are not being held simply because the Soviet Government cannot spare them or fears they may betray vital secrets to Israel or the West. What the Kremlin fears is the mass exodus of Jewish scientists which would inevitably follow if the road to Israel were as open as Mr. Kosygin said it was. Jews occupying good positions in industry and research are loth to apply to emigrate when their application may mean simply the loss of a job, much unpleasantness and no certainty of leaving Russia.

Recently the authorities have devised another trick for keeping the scientists back. Many of them, young men and on the reserve, have been served with call-up papers. If they report for duty and do their two months' training, they will then be deprived of exit visas for another couple of years, on the grounds that they have had access to military information. Consequently some of them are now in hiding to avoid receipt of the papers.

Despite all these obstacles the number of applicants for emigration is already in excess of 100,000. If the road were really "open," it would be many times greater.

There are, nevertheless, Soviet citizens the Government is glad to see the back of—the so-called "troublemakers," those who have contributed to the general movement for reform within the Soviet Union which has grown up in the last few years. This agitation, which so irritates and perplexes the Kremlin, groups together many different kinds of intelligent people who are trying to achieve for themselves independent thought and action in an oppressive society.

## *Shock for Soviet authorities*

In the ranks of the reformers who have suffered for their efforts and beliefs are many Jews, for example Yuli Daniel, Alexander Ginzburg and Pavel Litvinov. Many more Jews are to be found among the ranks of "second level" reformers who backed up the leaders at demonstrations but who have so far escaped the full weight of K.G.B. repression. One prominent Israeli claims that between 20 and 30 per cent. of reformers in the Soviet Union are in fact Jews. The Jewish contribution to this movement takes two forms.

In the first place the mass demand for visas to Israel by Zionists who want nothing to do with Soviet affairs has a side effect: the movement shocked the Russian authorities because it set an example which other protesters now follow in a different way.

Of course the Jews were helping their campaign by the cosmopolitan nature of their people. The Soviet Union, nearly 20 years after the death of Stalin, still persists in cutting off most of its citizens from the outside world. The aim of this political quarantine is to prevent Russians from catching a dose of democracy. The Jews in the nature of things, and particularly today when powerful lobbies on their behalf have been created in the outside world, are in regular contact with the West.

In the second place Soviet Jews form a powerful intellectual minority in science, scholarship and the arts. Even the ones who feel completely integrated in Soviet life are aware of the need for reform and greater liberty within the system they support.

In Israel we talked to a wide variety of immigrants from the Soviet Union. Their stories of their own and other people's life and suffering tell more about present-day Russia than the millions of words pumped by State propaganda machines.

The most eloquent spokesman for the Exodus, and indeed for the "democratic movement" in Russia, is Professor Mikhail Zand, a tall, intense intellectual, with a high forehead and thrown-back greying hair.

Now a Professor of Oriental Studies and an expert in ancient Persian scholarship, Mikhail Zand teaches and translates at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and by Israeli standards lives well. In the peace of a Tel Aviv office he looks back over the years of terror which swept over so many Jewish compatriots in the Soviet Union.

"My father, who was also an academic, was arrested in the great Stalin purge of 1937 and we never saw him again, although of course he was rehabilitated after his death like so many Russians."

Zand, despite this, graduated brilliantly from Moscow University. But his *cum laude* degree was not enough to override the disadvantage of his father having been branded as an "enemy of the people" though he had worked for Communism. As a Jew he could not get the kind of university job he wanted. The double brand kept him in a series of minor posts.

Returning to the capital under Khruschev, Zand started to dream of Israel. "My father and I chose different ways, for he had been an ardent Communist and an anti-Zionist." He was soon in trouble for joining an illegal Jewish *ulpan* where Muscovite Jews learned Hebrew. He also displeased the authorities by signing petitions against censorship and by speaking out against the prosecution of Alexander Ginzburg, the young writer and leader of the Soviet underground in the late 'Sixties.

Zand further irritated the Kremlin establishment by writing Jewish poetry and in December, 1969, by writing a document called "The Jewish Problem in the Soviet Union."

[illegible] organised a meeting at the Moscow [illegible] two were afraid, said exactly what the K.G.B. had told them to say. It was shameful. I went there as a journalist and was so indignant that I got up and started to speak about dissent. I wanted to speak out for the national conscience of the Jews, but they would not hear me.

"When the meeting ended I organised a Press conference there in the synagogue. Western newspaper correspondents were present and my words were recorded and published.

"Four militiamen came into the synagogue and arrested me. They held me for only a few hours and I believe that my release was due to the fact that the arrest had taken place under the eyes of Western witnesses."

Despite this experience the Professor, the kind of quiet, determined man that you might find at Oxford or Lancaster as well as at Moscow University, took part next day at a sit-in outside the offices of R.A. Rudenko, the Soviet public prosecutor. In Moscow a sit-in is not at all the comfortable piece of folklore it has become in London or Washington. Together with 38 other Muscovites he was arrested. The professor and seven others were sent to prison for 15 days on the standard Russian charge of "hooliganism". At Petrovka 38, the Moscow police headquarters, he went on hunger strike as a protest gesture for 13 days.

"Then they forcibly fed me, and this was torture. The K.G.B. doctor who fed me said quite cynically: 'Probably you will die. You will be thrown out as a useless detail of the machine and we shall say that it was an accident.'

"I replied: 'Now I can see that it is not obligatory for even a Soviet prison physician to have a conscience'."

Under a threat of a further sentence of up to three years they released the survivor. He went three days later to another sit-in, this time at the Supreme Soviet, and he spoke to some Western tourists, which is thought to be a heinous offence in Moscow.

"My home was watched constantly, and rather obviously, by the K.G.B. My wife heard from a neighbour in our block of flats who had been a member of the Soviet Embassy staff in London, thrown out for spying in 1963, that 'this is what we call psychological pressure supervision.'

"Because of my activities I had lost my job, and now the police called me in to ask why I had no job. In this Orwellian situation (I had read Orwell in a smuggled edition) it became obvious to me that they intended to throw me out as a 'parasite'."

Eventually, jobless and depressed, Zand got an exit visa for himself and his family a year ago. "Four days later they summoned me to the passport office responsible for exit visas. In the place of the office chief sat Leonid Kuzmich, [illegible] of the K.G.B. security section on Jewish matters. He

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

told me that my wife was trying to get out. Moscow hinted to confiscated because of my activities in the dissident movement.

"'You know, Mikhail Zand, we want to get you out of the Soviet Union but we have had complaints from proletarians—your behaviour is not good. You have had visits from people who want your advice about how to get out. You are in contact with foreigners to get information out of the Soviet Union'."

He had already paid for visas for himself, his wife and two children, sister, mother and niece. The money was never returned. While a wave of protest from the outside world burst over the Soviets about this one case they tried to get him thrown out of his flat in a journalists' co-operative.

"When I eventually left less than a year ago it was exactly like the Ministry of Truth operation in '1984' because they banned all my written work and even struck out quotations from my work in other books. It was as if for the Soviet Union I did not exist."

## *'Corruption' in the earthly kingdom*

This expert witness now in Israel sums up the aim of the Jewish movement as being a return to the historic home. "We have fought alongside Soviet friends, but their aim is to try and change the system within their country; our goal is to get out. For me it was a dilemma whether or not to leave because I knew that if I went I would never see my friends in the Soviet dissident movement again, though I might hope to see my Jewish friends later in Israel. We each go our own way, though from the Soviet point of view it is the Jews who are setting a bad example to the others."

Very different are the Georgian Jews who leave their southern Republic of the Soviet Union to go back to the land of their fathers. They are more like peasants, but they share the same Jewish feeling.

Over the past 18 months Georgians accounted for half of the total of arrivals of Soviet Jews in Israel. At a very jolly gathering at a flat in a suburb of Jerusalem we met Georgian families established in Israel. With the appropriately named Raphie Balva (he served in the R.A.F. during the war) as a translator we talked to the Georgians, who proposed toasts in Georgian brandy and offered little dishes of chicken and salad.

Two girls, their dark eyes big with wonder, had arrived only 24 hours before. Laila Papiashvili, aged 14, and her 11-year-old sister, had come from Kutaisi, Georgia's second city, to join their parents in Ashkelon.

On the whole life is more agreeable in Georgia than in most parts of the Soviet Union, partly because Stalin was Georgian and Moscow leaned to respect his home republic. The Jews there get along well with their neighbours. None we spoke with had any serious complaints about anti-Semitism.

They do, however, have an idealised picture of the State of Israel, equating it with an earthly republic of heaven. For this reason the most religious are shocked to find what they consider evidence of worldly corruption.

An official reported that some ladies had come to him to denounce Israelis who failed to wear proper clothes and even worse did not pray at the appointed time. "These people should be put in prison," they told him. Others complain about permissiveness in Israel. If you enter into something very close to the Kingdom of Heaven how can it be that there are pornography in the bookshops and lewd posters outside cinemas?

Every Soviet Jew in Israel has a story to tell about his old life, but for sheer persistence in face of difficulty it would be difficult to beat the case of Ezra Risenik, a Latvian watchmaker from Riga.

Peering at the innards of a watch in his little Jerusalem shop he said,

> "I was always a Zionist even before the world war and I finally got permission from the British authorities in Palestine to go there to live.
>
> "Unfortunately the certificate arrived at the beginning of September, 1939, and already the Germans and the Russians were on the march." Instead of going to Zion he was taken to a labour camp in Siberia.
>
> "There in 1942 I got a letter from the British embassy in Moscow saying that I could go to Palestine. I showed the letter to a K.G.B. man in the camp whom I knew and he said I would get into trouble if I showed it to anyone else but that I should keep it."
>
> It took Risenik 33 years to get to Israel. And even at the last moment he almost failed, for the K.G.B. wrote to him saying that before leaving he must give evidence at the trial of two friends in Riga charged with "anti-Soviet activities."
>
> Joseph Kerler, a bushy-eyebrowed Yiddish poet, bombarded the Soviet authorities with more than 400 appeals, petitions and applications before he finally got a visa to leave. Now a librarian at the Hebrew University, he says "I was a witness of the death of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. They shot the most eminent Jewish writers, they killed the great Samuel Marshak. For in the Soviet Union they fear less the atom bomb itself than the truth of the word."

## *Crime of using 'phone*

Soviet Jews in Israel hear many stories of frustration from friends left behind. Earlier this year Vladimir Slepak, a Soviet Jewish electronics expert, was told that he could not go because he knew about the electronics of Moscow's air defence system. He lost his job, as most people do, when he made his application and was then threatened by the K.G.B. with internment in a labour camp on the charge of being an idler. He had to work sharpening knives in a Moscow factory.

Another case comes from Kharkov in the Ukraine, where 120,000 Jews live. There the K.G.B. has been preparing a trial of Solomon Grinberg, an engineer, and Constantine Skoblinsky, a student, both charged with anti-Soviet activities. Both were ordered to give an undertaking that they would stop talking to Israeli friends on the telephone—for that was the extent of their anti-Soviet activities. The police searched their homes and took away Hebrew language text books and petitions to Soviet leaders asking for permission to leave.

A student in the same city named Isaac Shlaferman had his visa revoked after being given permission to leave. He was told that he could leave only if he agreed to testify in court against the other two accused.

The master mind of the campaign in Kharkov is Colonel Poliakov of the K.G.B., well known for his intensive anti-Jewish propaganda on television and in the Press. This is typical of the kind of local initiative which makes it so difficult to assess the impact of central Soviet policy towards the Jews.

Conditions vary enormously from place to place. S. K. Abramov, who heads the Israeli Committee which looks after immigrants, told us that not one Jew from Tashkent, where there is a large Jewish population, had

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

so far made his way to Israel. Often the flow starts after a test case such as the Ukraine one now under way. If some are allowed to move then many others apply at once. Fear and hope endlessly intermingle among provincial Jewish populations. In Benditchev, Byelorussia, fear triumphed. When one Jew applied for a visa the rest of the Jewish community turned on him and his family. "Why prejudice the safety of us all by such foolishness?" they said.

Elsewhere there is no limit to the ingenuity shown in finding excuses to leave. A Moscow Jew wrote to the authorities saying that he had heard that there were good Hebrew schools in Birobidzhan, a so-called autonomous region for Jews created by Stalin as a sop to Zionism, and he would like to go and work there.

The authorities replied that there was no such establishment in this desolate Siberian area. "In that case," replied the Muscovite Jew, "I would like to apply for permission to go to Israel."

A Jew in the Soviet Union cannot conceal his Jewishness. Like all other townsdwellers, he has to carry an identity card which includes an entry for his nationality, and if both his parents were Jewish he is shown as "Jewish." Only if he is the son of a mixed marriage does he have the right at the age of 16 to choose whether he wishes to be described as "Jewish" or as belonging to the nationality of his non-Jewish parent.

In view of the discrimination which they know their child will suffer as a Jew, many parents in such a position urge their child to opt for a different nationality. There is official encouragement also, because every time a Jew chooses not to be labelled Jewish it is a step on the road to assimilating the Jewish population.

The Council for Soviet Jewry, with its headquarters in a Tel Aviv suburb, shares much of the pain and frustration of Soviet Jews in their struggle to leave Russia. Last month a cable was received at the organisation's offices. It was sent from Kishinev, the capital of Moldavia, the Soviet republic bordering a country which has freed thousands of Jews since the end of World War II—Rumania. The cable read simply: "Otkazali. Wolf." ("Refused. Wolf.") It signified that Wolf Gitelmann, 41, a journalist working for Moldavian Radio, had been refused a visa to emigrate to Israel, after trying for more than two years.

## *Dancer's word 'out of turn'*

Gitelmann's case is a family tragedy arising from his daughter's love affair with a young Jew sentenced to two years' imprisonment last year for "anti-Soviet, pro-Zionist activity." After the trial the daughter promptly applied to go to Israel, and at once lost her job at a polytechnic institute. Wolf Gitelmann also decided that he would leave, but Moldavian Radio checkmated him by declaring that he had been engaged in secret work.

Gitelmann went to Moscow to pursue his case with the Ministry of Radio, and won from them acceptance of the fact that his job had not been secret at all. It did not help. He and his daughter are still in Russia.

It has become clear that for several reasons the Soviet authorities — the K.G.B., police and bureaucracy— have dug their heels in over allowing particular Jews to set foot on the road to Israel.

There is the case of Valery Panov, 33, one of Russia's leading ballet dancers. Panov was once the principal dancer with the Leningrad Kirov ballet, and for his services to culture won a State prize and became an "honoured artist" of the Soviet Union.

But while the Kirov Ballet company has toured many countries, including Britain, and won considerable acclaim for its technique, the genius of Panov has been recognised only within the Soviet Union. For Panov has not been abroad since 1957, when he went with the company to the United States and by all accounts unwisely "spoke out of turn" about conditions in the Soviet Union.

In 1971, aware that a dancer's life is cruelly short, he joined the Vilnyus ballet company as a director. In March this year, having decided to emigrate to Israel, he asked for a reference.

His decision had the effect of a bombshell on the manage- [illegible] of the Vilnyus ballet company. As Panov was taking a routine morning class in March his lesson was invaded by more than 300 of the staff, who screamed abuse at him for deciding to leave Russia.

On April 6, the ballet company's trade union held a meeting and voted to dismiss Panov from his post.

On March 9 a letter appeared in the West recalling those Russians who had taken the lead in the past few years in exposing Soviet injustices. It was written from Moscow and signed by five Russians well-known in the West for their reformist activities: Yuri Glazov, a linguist, Yuri Stein, a film producer, Yuri Titov, an artist, Alexander Volpin, a mathematician and son of the famous Soviet poet Sergei Yesenin, and Vladimir Gershovich.

They expressed their solidarity with "the victims of recent repressions and our most profound concern at the turn which the internal political wheel may take." What happened to them is illustrative of the new Soviet approach to such "troublemakers."

Within three weeks of the letter appearing Glazov and Stein were handed exit visas. For them the lure of the homeland of Israel has little or no appeal; they admit to climbing on the bandwagon of the Jewish exodus simply to get out of the Soviet Union. Today they wait quietly in Rome for permission to go to the United States.

They expect that they will be joined by Yuri Titov, who has also received his exit visa. But, for different reasons, Volpin and Gershovich are unlikely ever to leave Russia. A week after the publication of the letter Volpin was called to the K.G.B. headquarters in Moscow and told: "What is all this about you complaining in a letter published abroad that you are not allowed to leave the Soviet Union? Why, you've never asked to go. Now please go away and put in a proper application."

Volpin's friends in Rome, in regular touch with him by telephone, report that the visa has since been granted. But, ironically, Volpin, a persistent, outspoken critic of Soviet policies, does not want to leave Russia.

The scapegoat for the letter is Gershovich, 36, mathematician, twice interned in an insane asylum, a Red Square protester over the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and jobless for years for his activities. He has been told that he will never get a visa because his wife was once engaged on "secret work."

The bleak future of brave men like this is heartrending to those who do get away and are now living in the comfort- [illegible] thinking about what

Such a fortunate man is Mikhail Kalik, a trendy Soviet film maker with a strong-jawed brown face and a Napoleon-style haircut who now lives at Mevasseret Zion, on the hills almost in sight of Jerusalem, with his plump and lively wife. An air of show business pervades the bungalow; there are film posters on a wall and a signed picture of Kim Novak. Over the sofa is a snapshot of Kalik's friend Solzhenitsyn and two other friends who were the originals of two characters in Solzhenitsyn's best-selling novel "The First Circle." On May Day yet another of Kalik's artistic Moscow circle arrived down the immigrant route to join him.

Mikhail Kuperman, a Muscovite painter, and his wife, Mila, a beautiful blonde model who held the joint titles of Miss Moscow and Miss Russia, are now his neighbours. Her arrival is one in the eye for the Soviet "rag trade," for she often travelled on behalf of Soviet fashion houses to display clothes in Western countries.

It was not until after the death of Stalin that Mikhail Kalik was allowed to leave a forced labour camp after a four-year sentence for "terrorism and anti-Soviet activities." The prison camp came as a kind of post-graduate course after he left university in 1951.

Kalik's film "Following the Sun" (there is a poster in his room of the export version) enjoyed some success in the West but got him into trouble at home.

The film was about the problems of Soviet youth and their aspirations to follow the sun in search of life—a kind of Muscovite "Easy Rider." He did another film on a similar theme which the authorities refused to show at all for 18 months, and it was at this point that Kalik decided there was no future for him in Moscow.

Kalik then applied for a visa to Israel, and of course lost his job and his position in the Film Makers' Union. He had to live on money from other Jews.

An international group of film people who admired his work made appeals on his behalf. Otto Preminger, Kim Novak and Arthur Miller were the leading spirits in this movement, which he believes helped to save him from arrest. Finally the visa came.

For earlier film work a grateful State had awarded Kalik a Medal of Honour. This same medal he now posted back to the authorities. "It was a fair swap—a dreary old medal in return for a visa of honour."

Now busy learning Hebrew, [illegible]

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

he will do in Israel. With a great Russian laugh, for he loves and personalises one kind of Russia as well as one kind of Israel. I said: 'Maybe I will make a film called "Visa to Paradise,' for that is what it is in Israel."

CPYRGHT

SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, London
28 May 1972

RUSSIANS AGAINST THE KREMLIN-3
Martyrs of Religious Protest

# *To Siberia for saying prayers at home—account of a secret Soviet trial : Movement back to the Church*

WORKING in a Siberian labour camp this Sunday morning are two middle-aged Baptists, a man and a woman. They were sent there as a punishment for the grave offence of handing out Bibles and teaching the Lord's Prayer to Russian children.

Their action and the punishment it brought stand token for an important element in the protest movement in Russia today and the way the State reacts to it. Religious dissidence has its own martyrs and its own underground propagation of the faith through *samizdat* or self-publication.

Every Soviet believer has the constitutional right to organise and take part in religious worship. For good measure the Government has signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948, article 18 of which runs: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom . . . to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance."

Despite this, hundreds of citizens have been arrested for preaching the Gospel. Particularly during the past 12 years a bitter and little-publicised anti-religious campaign has been conducted by the State. Its special target has been the Baptist Church, with perhaps three million members, but it also oppresses the Russian Orthodox Church, the Roman Catholics, and sects such as Jehovah's Witnesses. In spite of the persecutions there are still three and a half million Catholics, and the Orthodox Church claims to have as many as 30 million adherents.

The churches in Russia are tolerated only within strict limits. The law bans religious organisations from taking part in social and culture activities, they may not do charitable work, and they are forbidden to organise biblical, literary or social groups. They cannot set up playgrounds for children, and they may not even organise church outings.

On the one hand the State "guarantees" freedom of worship; it also underwrites freedom of anti-religious propaganda. And under this heading good party members are encouraged to knock religion as hard as they can.

The two Baptists now serving sentence in Siberia were only recently put on trial in the small Western Ukrainian town of Nikolaev. The trial was held in secret, but another Baptist illegally took notes of what was said in court and the transcript was smuggled out of the Soviet Union. This document is the source for the story which follows.

Georgi Zheltonozhko and Nadya Troshchenko were two factory workers, converted to the Baptist faith, whose fervour led them to break with the "official" and recognised Baptist Church and join the *Initsiativniki*, an action group of reformist evangelical Baptists. The original Baptist Church was firmly established in pre-revolutionary Russia by German and British influences. Its simple Bible Christianity appeals strongly to workers and to people in labour camps, and its reformist wing in particular has long been in trouble with authority. In the past decade no fewer than 600 Baptists have been imprisoned and nearly 200 are still inside.

The trial of Georgi Zheltonozhko and Nadya Troshchenko lasted three days. Georgi was charged with receiving and distributing "Bibles, New Testaments and other spiritual literature, thereby trampling on Soviet laws," and with holding prayer meetings at his home.

It is highly likely that the literature bore the imprint "Christian publishing house," an organisation which on its clandestine press has been producing Bibles, hymn books and magazines. This has been one of the most daring and effective ways of protest by the breakaway Baptists. The movement's illegal journal "Fraternal Leaflet" made its first appearance in 1965 and was handwritten and mimeographed. But since last year it has been offset printed, and the K.G.B. have so far failed to shut down the illegal printing works.

To the annoyance of the Government some 40,000 New Testaments and hymn books have been run off and circulated to Baptists throughout the Soviet Union. It is the movement's way of replying to the Government's refusal to print religious works for them, or give them permission to do it themselves.

It was for receiving this "illegal" literature from Georgi that Nadya Troshchenko found herself in court. It was further alleged that she had read New Testament stories and poems to children, and that she had made them kneel in prayer.

At the beginning of the trial the judge asked Georgi: "Did you import and distribute literature?"

"Yes, and I gave it to everybody," replied Georgi, who had already refused to accept help from defence counsel on the grounds that "Truth does not need any defence."

Judge: "Where is it printed?"

Georgi: "Praise God, I don't know."

"Why did you do this?"

"According to Lenin's decree on religion, citizens are permitted not only to believe, but also to confess their faith and propagate it. Lenin granted freedom, he didn't limit it; the same is true of the United Nations convention on human rights."

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 COPYRGHT

He complained to the judge about the coarse behaviour of Soviet officials who broke up a prayer meeting he had organised. Some were drunk, and they insulted the believers and called them a rabble.

"You tell us to preach only in a house of prayer. The Lord says: 'Go into all the world and preach the Gospel'."

Judge: "The Gospels were written a long time ago, they can change like our laws according to circumstances. The Bible was written for those times; today the author would have written something different."

At this point the prosecutor intervened. "If I read my Romans right I find at 13.2 it says 'Obey the authorities'."

Georgi: "The answer to that is Ephesians 6.12—'We are not contending against flesh and blood but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness.' We are fulfilling the law of Christ, the Gospel, which says 'Who should we obey, man or God?'; the lesser yields to the greater. I submit to God; to whom do you submit?"

Nadya Troshchenko was formally charged at this point with gathering children together, reading the New Testament and poems to them, and teaching them prayers. The judge asked, "Do you plead guilty?"

Nadya: "No! Christ said 'Suffer the little children to come unto me'."

Judge: "Children can choose for themselves after the age of 18, but you are brainwashing schoolchildren of 11 or 12 years old."

Nadya: "But before they have to choose their own path they should be taught both sides. No parents can abandon their children to ruin and death."

Judge: "Did you read the New Testament to children and do you intend to continue to do so?"

Nadya: "Yes, in the presence of their parents. As for the future, I hope I needn't read the New Testament to them any more. I hope they will read it to me."

A 12-year-old boy called as a witness "confessed" to kneeling with Nadya and to saying the Lord's Prayer. He was asked to repeat the words of the prayer before the court, which he did. He then burst into tears and was sent outside.

Finally Georgi was given an opportunity to speak in his own defence. "You are trying me for my faith and not for breaking the law," he said. "Our faith cannot be contained only in a church building. Faith without works is dead, as a body is dead without the spirit."

He accused the authorities of not allowing children to be brought up in a Christian spirit. "You start educating children into Communist movements. We have to train our children too, because when they grow up it may be too late to tell them about God. I lost 27 years before being converted, and I don't want to see them do the same."

Nadya also defended herself. "In the laws on religion," she said, "it is forbidden to speak the word of God except in church and it is forbidden to teach children. That means that faith itself is prohibited. A Communist needs the party rule book and a Christian needs the New Testament and spiritual literature. The Bible is tolerated in our country, yet you cannot buy one in a shop."

In conclusion she said: "Our Lord teaches us to love everyone, not to hate. Whatever sentence you give us I will pray that the Lord may open your eyes."

Georgi Zheltonozhko was sent to a labour camp for three years. Nadya Troshchenko got 18 months for teaching the Bible to children.

"What about our children—should we inspire in them a love of the Church or not? Yes . . ." Alexander Solzhenitsyn, winner of the 1970 Nobel Prize for Literature, made this defiant assertion in his Lenten letter to Patriarch Pimen, head of the Russian Orthodox Church, which was published in *The Sunday Telegraph* on April 9.

Many people seem surprised to hear such an affirmation of the Christian faith from one of the Soviet Union's outstanding personalities 54 years after the State adopted a policy of atheism. But Solzhenitsyn had made his Christian sympathies known years ago, and thousands of other Russians have been writing and signing such letters for more than a decade.

Solzhenitsyn made two points which reinforce the protests of many other Russian Christians, Orthodox, Roman Catholic and Protestant. First, many Christians are denied any possibility of worshipping legally, because there are vast areas where the Soviet authorities refuse to license churches. Second, the present leadership of the Churches is not strong enough in resisting the State's control of church life.

Both these points have been consistently made by Russian Christians for more than a decade. Years before Soviet Jews began addressing the outside world, Russian Christians were putting their case for religious freedom logically, coolly and with a wealth of documented fact.

The Russian Baptists began to write letters of protest in 1960 when Khruschev inspired the most vigorous anti-religious campaign since the early 1930s. They have indeed been protesting against persecution for their religious beliefs for nearly 100 years. Their history has made them resilient and has left them with a keen memory of the strength of evangelical Christianity in the world outside.

Their numbers grew in adversity to an estimated three million in the late 'Fifties, and since then many have been converted. Baptists protested strongly when the Government began closing churches, imprisoning religious leaders and generally putting intolerable pressure upon young people who showed even a passing interest in the Christian faith. These churchmen appealed in turn to the leaders of their own denomination, the State authorities, their co-religionists outside the country and finally to the United Nations and other international bodies. Their case was that they and countless other believers wished to be loyal to their country, but were being forced to act illegally, because the Soviet authorities would not license religious worship for thousands of Christian groups all over the Soviet Union. Where registration was granted this meant submitting to a surveillance which was unacceptable. Countless people could not enjoy even that minimal degree of religious freedom which the Soviet constitution was supposed to guarantee.

The violent reaction of the State against these protests was perhaps predictable. The reaction from the Moscow Baptist Church leadership and the lack of it from the Church in general was more surprising.

The Baptist leadership in Russia had already compromised itself in the eyes of many believers by accepting a "letter of instruction" from the State which went beyond the law in the restrictions on evangelism and work with young people.

Surprisingly the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists ruled that "an elder presbyter must be clearly aware of and remember the [illegible] service nowa-

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

days is not to attract new members (that is to say they should refrain from finding new members). It also decreed that an elder presbyter had the duty of suppressing "unhealthy missionary phenomena" — meaning that such people should not proselytise.

These and other compromising edicts split the Protestant movement in Russia. (Solzhenitsyn himself complained about similar compromise in the Orthodox Church.) A considerable number of rank-and-file Baptists broke with their leaders. In the end the Church leadership had to rescind the offending "letter of instruction," but the damage had been done.

The driving force of the reform Baptists in the past few years has been the Council of Baptist Prisoners' Relatives. Despite the arrest of successive groups of leading members the Council collected precise information about Baptists in prison, and sent a series of letters to the United Nations but without any result.

John Miller, then in Moscow, talked to a breakaway Baptist, Mrs. Yakimenkova at House 84, Desna Village, in the Leninsky District of the Moscow Region, who was one of five women to write to U Thant, U.N. Secretary General, after their menfolk had been arrested. On a bitterly cold day he found her in a simple wooden house without water or electricity. In the living room, furnished with only a table, two chairs and a cupboard, was Mrs. Yakimenkova with her mother and two small children.

For holding illegal prayer meetings there her husband was serving a two-year prison-camp sentence. Once convinced that her visitor was not a K.G.B. agent, Mrs. Yakimenkova began to weep and spoke freely about the unhappy life of a Soviet Protestant. "Tell the United Nations that we hear nothing from them," she said. "Our prayer meetings are broken up by the police. They send our men to the camps. We, the wives, our aged parents and our children are left to die from starvation."

The Baptists are encouraged by the thought that more people outside are at last prepared to sponsor their cause. A concerted movement of Western public opinion like that which has sustained the Jews could help them enormously, and in this cause a day of prayer for Eastern Europe has been organised for June 4. It is sponsored by the British-based Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism.

A parallel movement of protest within the Russian Orthodox Church was begun by two priests, Father Nikolai Eshliman and Father Gleb Yakunin, with the support of Archbishop Yermogen. The priests wrote an open letter to the Government requesting that religious freedom tolerated under the law should be allowed in fact. Another letter complained that the Church leadership had failed to take a sufficiently strong stand against the spread of militant atheism. For this they were dismissed. Archbishop Yermogen made a similar approach to the Patriarch, and is now in enforced retirement.

## *Younger people returning to faith*

Here, perhaps, is the greatest tragedy of Christian life in Russia today—the State has such a hold over the Church that it bars the most worthy from office. This is not to say that all bishops and official Baptist leaders are traitors to the Gospel. Many of them struggle to keep their church afloat and sustain a ministry of high quality, as Archbishop Yermogen did until 1965. Nevertheless, the pressures of atheism are tremendous, and they lead some individuals and groups into sorry postures.

Last year the *Sobor* (General Council) of the Russian Orthodox Church met for the first time since 1945. Metropolitan Pimen became Patriarch (there was no other candidate) and the Church signally failed to raise any of the most crucial problems which confront it—lack of sufficient theological education, religious books, and parish churches in thousands of towns and villages, and the inability of the priest to control matters in his own parish because of the current regulations putting all administrative matter in the hands of a council of laity (whose membership is itself controlled by the atheist authorities, according to Soviet law). The only mention of such problems was in a gathering exclusively for bishops the day before the *Sobor* officially convened. This meeting was uncanonical, but at least it had the merit of containing some freedom of speech, which was totally absent from the monumental boredom of the set speeches.

Before the Revolution Russia had some 80,000 Orthodox churches, chapels and monasteries. Perhaps only about 8,000 still function today. Church leaders are reluctant to give figures. All they will say is that there are eight Metropolitans, 30 Archbishops, 35 Bishops, and two ecclesiastical academies and three seminaries.

The Soviet Government's attitude to religion is to say there is nothing to worry about because the congregations consist largely of elderly people. But evidence reaching the West suggests that for the first time in 100 years younger people and especially intellectuals are beginning to return to the fold.

One remarkable example is provided by the case history of Sergei Kourdakov, a 22-year-old from the Kamchatka area of the Soviet Far East who is now in Canada. As a zealous Komsomol (Young Communist) leader he was a part-time K.G.B. informer, and he specialised in harrying the Baptists in his district.

For Kourdakov the moment of revelation came one night last year when he and his friends broke into a clandestine prayer meeting.

"There was one old lady there who kept on praying as we set about them. I was so angry that I was about to do her in. I raised my hand. Then I realised that she was not praying for herself—she was praying that God might forgive me. Suddenly I felt somebody holding my fist in check. There was nobody, but I knew there must be something special there."

Kourdakov became a Christian and went to sea as a radio operator. He jumped ship and chose freedom in Canada.

Another Soviet weapon against the spread of religion is confinement in an asylum for the insane. A document in *samizdat* about this, called "Notes from the Red House," recently reached the West. Its author is Gennady Shimanov, who was incarcerated in the notorious Kashchenko mental hospital in Moscow as a "semi-violent" patient.

One of his doctor-interrogators said to him: "If you had grown up in a religious family or had lived somewhere in the West, well, then we could have looked at your religiousness in another way. But you were educated in a Soviet school and were brought up in a family of non-believers. You are an educated person, I'm ready even to admit that you know more about philosophy and religion than I do. And suddenly—snap—you're religious!

"Your symptoms are a one-sided fascination with religion. You've cut yourself off from life. After all, how do healthy believers behave? An old dear pops into church, crosses herself, goes away and gets on with other things. Already she has forgotten about God. There are still such people, but they are getting fewer. With you it is quite different. We are worried about you."

Religion, it seems, is acceptable to the régime so long as it can be seen to be dying out.

Throughout his time in the mental hospital Shimanov, a distinguished army officer cashiered for his Christian belief, showed himself a tough nut to crack. He devoted himself to proving that it is possible to be "normal" and at the same time a devout Christian. It took a hunger strike to free him. As soon as he was outside again he bravely used his notes of the interrogation to write and publish a full account of his time in the mental hospital.

The Roman Catholics, like the Jews, were victims of oppression in Russia long before the Communists took over. Imperial Russia feared the Roman Church as a powerful rival to Orthodoxy

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

and an undesirable foreign influence. The Soviets saw the Vatican as a threat to their dream of world Communism. They feared its political authority, spiritual discipline and implacable opposition to the godless State.

Catholicism might have been stamped out as a result of ruthless persecution between the two World Wars had not the Red Army seized Lithuania, Latvia and Eastern Poland, all areas with large Catholic populations.

Before 1940 Lithuania had three million people, of whom 80 per cent. were Catholics. Almost half the churches have since been closed. The number of priests fell from 1,500 in 1940 to about 800 at the end of the 1960s. There are only four active bishops instead of 14, and two others are under permanent house arrest.

An appeal in March to Mr. Brezhnev, the party leader, was signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics and sent directly to Dr. Waldheim, the new United Nations Secretary General, as previous appeals had never reached the Kremlin leaders. It was explained that there would have been many more signatures but police had detained collectors and seized lists. The appeal said: "We expect such effort from the Government as will help us Catholics to regard ourselves as citizens of the Soviet Union with equal rights."

This appeal fell on deaf ears. Ten days ago the upsurge of religious feeling in that part of the Soviet Empire, coupled with renascent nationalist aspirations, led to bloodshed in the streets.

Young Lithuanians clashed with Russian troops in the streets of Kaunas, the second largest city in the republic, after a 20-year-old Roman Catholic factory worker named Roman Kalanta had burned himself to death in a public park. His gesture had both religious and political motives.

What brought the crowds out to shout "Freedom for Lithuania" was frustration and resentment kindled by such incidents as the arrest last summer of a Roman Catholic priest, Father Zdebskis. Six K.G.B. men broke in and took him as he was preparing children for their first Communion.

He spent more than two months in prison awaiting trial, and was beaten.

Although the authorities tried to keep the date of the hearing secret, 600 people gathered outside the district court on the day. Reports smuggled out described the scene:

"Many girls brought flowers. But the militia moved in to break up the crowd. One woman had a rib broken, another fell unconscious from a blow on the head. Women and girls were beaten and dragged to police cars."

Father Zdebskis was sentenced to a year in an internment camp.

Another group of Eastern-rite Catholics probably numbering about four million, who came under Soviet rule with the annexation of the Western Ukraine in 1939, has been equally repressed. They have never fitted either into the Orthodox or the Catholic framework, but as they owe an allegiance to Rome they are highly suspect to the Kremlin. Their churches and schools have either passed into Orthodox hands or been closed, but the Church continues to flourish underground.

Other religious minorities such as the Seventh-Day Adventists, the Pentecostals and the Jehovah's Witnesses have also suffered badly during the recurring anti-religious campaigns, particularly during the "black years" of the Khruschev era. These sects are treated as nothing more or less than fanatical underground political movements. But they survive.

One of the most colourful characters in the Christian wing of the protest movement in Russia is Anatoli Levitin, a teacher and literary scholar.

Since 1959 Levitin has been a frequent and bold contributor to *samizdat* on religious themes, and particularly against violations of religious freedom. He has spoken out against constant interference by the authorities in the life of the Church and against the unchecked power of elders appointed by the State. His special target has been the Orthodox Church hierarchy itself for quietly acquiescing to State edicts.

Levitin was quick to see that freedom was indivisible and that there could be no religious freedom if basic human rights were curtailed. Throughout the late 1960s he organised protests on behalf of young Russians arrested for political offences and saw to it that they were aired in *samizdat*. It was, of course, only a question of time before Levitin's protests were stifled. Last year he began a three-year sentence in a labour camp for "anti - Soviet" activities.

★

To witness an Easter liturgy in the Russian Orthodox Church is to experience a spiritual reality which renders the question "Can religion survive in Russia?" purely academic.

The procession of clergy and deacons walks around the church, looking for the body of Christ. Not finding him, they fling open the door of the darkened church and ask where he is. "He is not here. He is risen — *Khristos voskres*!" comes back the answer.

A few voices inside the church take up the call — *Khristos voskres* at first murmuring as though in disbelief. Then more and more voices join in, until it becomes a triumphant shout. The choirs reaffirm the news in jubilation.

As the volume swells, so the light in the church becomes brighter. First, only a single point of light, then two—then more and more, as the faithful light their candles and pass the flame from one to another.

Each one is a pool of light which frames the face. On that face is the affirmation of faith achieved through suffering. For them resurrection is not something to be argued about, it is a reality here and now, the most positive experience of their lives.

SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, London
4 June 1972

CPYRGHT

## RUSSIANS AGAINST THE KREMLIN-4
### Leaders Tell of Fight for Human Rights in Russia

"THEY came at nine o'clock in the morning and started looking for things and taking them away. They even took a parcel I received from London a month ago. It contained some woollen pullovers and a pair of trousers."

Pyotr Yakir, leader of the Action Group for the Defence of Civil Rights, was describing a visit from the Soviet Union's secret police, the K.G.B. We had telephoned him in Moscow, and, while Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet leader, talked to President Nixon, Yakir was telling us about the reform movement in Russia—conscious all the time that K.G.B. men were listening.

Because of his fears for [illegible] ances while the United States President was in town, K.G.B. men had carried out numerous search and arrest operations in Moscow. At Yakir's place they had been thorough.

"They take away everything written on a typewriter," he said. "They seize all books published abroad. They are after typewriters, tape-recorders and cameras. On May 6, seventeen such searches were carried out in Moscow alone. Then they photographed the walls of my flat. I have a lot of icons in my home.

In Stalin's day, of course, it would not have been possible to conduct such a telephone conversation. And it is to achieve such personal freedoms and civil rights workers are struggling.

Because of his background Pyotr Yakir, who is 47, holds a special place in the Russian reform movement. His father, General Iona Yakir, was one of Russia's top military leaders in the 1930s, and was swept away in Stalin's great purge before World War II—shot as a "German spy" along with thousands of other officers.

Yakir, himself, still only 14, spent the next 14 years in and out of prison camps. His mother, slightly less lucky, got 18 years. He was rehabilitated in 1956 when de-Stalinisation was fashionable and he has since worked as an historian in the Academy of Science in Moscow.

[illegible] many Russians, Yakir is

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

obsessed with the injustices of recent Soviet history. Apart from his own rehabilitation, he wants to clear his father, and he is determined to do everything possible to make sure the bad old days of reasonless purges never return.

His privileged position in the eyes of the secret police arises from this and the fact that the K.G.B. itself looks back with horror on the worst days of Stalin, for even some of its own operators suffered the fate of those they were persecuting.

Yakir has emerged as a principal leader of the dissident movement and he is accepted in this rôle by the authorities. His special position has so far given him immunity from arrest.

An example occurred when he was making his way to Red square to take part in a demo. A militiaman questioned him in the Moscow Metro about a trifling breach of the law. As soon as the police knew the demonstration had ended, they released him.

Again, when he led the now traditional Constitution Day assembly before the Pushkin monument last December, although he was taken to the police station, the K.G.B. took over and merely said reproachfully: "You are always looking backwards. We understand, of course; you had a hard time of it. But now you should look towards the future. The future is fine, comrade."

Yakir, however, believes that until the guilty secrets of the Stalinist past have been unlocked and comprehended, no true step towards further freedom can be taken..

Yet he is optimistic about the possibility of change. "We may not be there to see the changes, but among the young people there are many who are active. No independent-minded person in the Soviet Union wants to retreat into the past. They beat us. They kill us. But people will go on thinking in a new way."

The authorities were busy trying to make sure that not a scrap of opposition was left anywhere, he said. "In the Ukraine they have already succeeded. There, even the families of arrested men are afraid to speak to each other. Every day the police call them in for questioning just to intimidate them. More than 90 people have been arrested." The situation, he said, was the same in Leningrad, in Lithuania, in Novosibirsk, Siberia—"science city," where most of Russia's advanced research is carried out—and at Kharkov and Sverdlovsk.

"But they have not yet managed to silence people in Moscow. This is very disagreeable for the authorities. They don't like it when they send their men to search homes and people refuse to let them in. They cannot understand why people are not afraid of them."

The Action Group for the Defence of Civil Rights is the most aggressive organisation working for reform in the Soviet Union. Its philosophy is based on the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Soviet constitution, and on the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights which the Soviet Government accepted. The Group acts by issuing strongly-worded appeals and protests, denouncing injustices committed by the courts and by the secret police.

* * *

The other important and influential reform platform in Russia today is the Rights of Man Committee, with a cluttered bedsitter for an office in a street near the skyscraper Soviet Foreign Ministry. Its secretary is Valery Chalidze, 32, a physicist. Once a week he stays at home to be available to anyone—including foreigners—who wishes to inquire about the Committee's work. He insists on "open" interviews because, he argues, the Committee is operating within the law and has nothing to hide.

The Committee's founder was Dr. Andrei Sakharov, one of Russia's most distinguished nuclear physicists, often described as the "Father of the Soviet H-Bomb." He has been a full member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences for 20 years, and holds the Stalin Prize and an Order of Lenin for his work on controlled nuclear fission.

For nearly a decade, 51-year-old Sakharov has been quietly calling for political liberalisation and economic reform—argued from the position of a loyal and respectable orthodox but worried Soviet subject. In 1966 he was one of 25 signatories of an open letter to the First Secretary of the Soviet Communist party, Leonid Brezhnev, warning against the danger of a revival of Stalinism.

## *Protestor called 'psychopathic'*

Dr. Sakharov wants to see East and West co-operating and converging rather than fighting each other. He maintains that the rule of the Communist party would be strengthened not weakened if the bureaucrats dumped Stalin's antiquated economic centralism and introduced Western-style planning and technology.

Where Sakharov has begun to make his mark is in the field of political and philosophical self-expression. In 1970 he and some colleagues brought pressure on the Soviet authorities over the detention in a mental clinic of Dr. Zhores Medvedev, an internationally-known geneticist. His "crime" had been to protest because the Russian Government prevented serious co-operation between himself and overseas scientists. He was promptly released—although officially he was described as "pathologically psychopathic."

Sakharov decided to broaden the struggle for basic human rights, and in November that year the Rights of Man Committee came into being. The two other founder-members were Dr. Andrei Tverdokhlebov, another Moscow scientist, and Valery Chalidze.

The Sakharov Committee, as it is sometimes known, has none of the characteristics of a political movement. It sets itself modest aims summed up as "theoretical research and constructive criticism of the present state of legal guarantee of freedom for the individual in Soviet law." Members lay great stress on their belief in the principles of the United Nations.

The Soviet authorities neither recognise nor forbid the Sakharov Committee. They content themselves with keeping its members under close supervision.

Valery Chalidze told us over the telephone: "A month ago we issued an Address to the Supreme Soviet appealing to it to help in resolving the problem of the Tartars deported from the Crimea during the war. Many of them would like to return to their homeland. We urged the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet to take action to ensure that local authorities do not put obstacles in their way. We have had no reply. But we did not expect one. For the moment we simply send our proposals in the hope that they will do some good."

Chalidze also spoke about a study the Committee had carried out into the rights of people committed to "psychiatric hospitals."

He complained that "the biggest mistake people make about our Committee is to think of it as an organ of opposition. The word 'opposition' is a political term. We are a scholarly association purely juridical, and we have no connection with politics nor, therefore, with opposition. Our job is to help the State and not to oppose it."

The Committee works on the principle that in the Soviet Union "everything which is not forbidden is allowed," unlike many Soviet citizens who see no difference between the law as it is written and as the authorities choose to interpret it—an attitude Russian reformers would like to change. The Committee receives from Soviet citizens many letters about the violation of rights. In turn it informs the Soviet population through its underground journal *Social Problems.*

Questioned about the success of the Committee's campaign, Chalidze replied: "Even with the best will in the world I do not think the authorities could put our recommendations into effect immediately. So it is difficult to speak in terms of 'successes'."

* * *

The only group to have produced anything like a coherent programme of political reform within the Soviet

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT
Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Union is the Democratic Movement, although it does not have any obvious formal organisation and the leaders do not identify themselves publicly. It issued a manifesto in 1969, and last year sent a summary of aims to the Supreme Soviet: The removal of the leaders of the Communist party from the Government; the transfer of all power to the Supreme Soviet; repeal of all anti-constitutional laws; more democratic freedom; the release of political prisoners; democratic elections and eventually a new constitution.

The Democrats promulgate their programme by means of the *samizdat* (or self-publication) method. *Samizdat* was originally the means of communicating to the public the works of authors who could not get their poems, essays and novels through the State publishing houses; it by-passed Glavlit, the censorship organisation.

Because it is a criminal offence in the Soviet Union to use a printing press without official permission, pieces of *samizdat* had to be handwritten or typed. The novelist Solzhenitsyn, for example, laboriously copied out by hand 250 copies of a letter he wrote to the Soviet Writers Union condemning it for accepting censorship.

As the reform movement began to develop into a serious force in the mid 'Sixties the *samizdat* industry moved into straight political action, and in the past 10 years it has become the most important means of expression for the various groups campaigning for change.

In its simplest form a typewritten sheet is copied by a sympathiser and passed from friend to friend like a chain letter until eventually hundreds of copies are in circulation. In the period 1966-70 over 700 of these documents reached the West. They provided up-to-the-minute news of arrests, searches and trials. The fact that such information became public caused consternation in the Kremlin, which struck back by declaring *samizdat* illegal. The criminal code was amended to make such activity punishable by three years' imprisonment.

## *Prisoners stitch up their mouths*

Nevertheless, in April, 1968, there appeared a new and significant underground bi-monthly called *Chronicle of Current Events* which has had an important effect on the morale of the reform movement. As well as co-ordinating the activities of the various groups, the *Chronicle* has become a reliable news bulletin for all those struggling for change in the Soviet Union. Last month No. 24 reported the protest of 15 prisoners at conditions in a Leningrad labour camp. They, [illegible] stitched up their own mouths, and as punishment six were sent to a psychiatric hospital and nine into solitary confinement.

The underground Press has made it possible for the first time in Soviet Russia for genuine political debate to be carried on outside the State system. Differences of opinion can now be argued out on the pages of what amounts to a free Press.

In December the Central Committee of the Communist party, the 241-strong policy-making group, alarmed at the spread of reformist activity, called for measures to end *samizdat*. The K.G.B.'s first step was to crack down on publication of news about oppression. After dozens of raids the security men added hundreds of names to the list of those considered dangerous because they demand elementary rights.

The continual cycle of protests and repression continues. Many leaders of the movement are now wasting their lives in Siberian labour camps and in exile. One is Andrei Amalrik, 31, the author and playwright who for a brief spell in the late 1960s became the most outspoken critic of the Soviet system.

On May 21, 1970, four black Volga cars carrying 14 men, most of them officers of the K.G.B., pulled up outside Amalrik's *dacha* some 100 miles south-east of Moscow. They searched the two small rooms of this simple wooden building for more than five hours. Amalrik, typically, told them several times that their action was illegal as they had not produced a warrant. But they seized his typewriter, letters, and a copy of his book "Can the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?" extracts of which appeared in *The Sunday Telegraph*. Amalrik himself was taken to the K.G.B. headquarters in Moscow and interrogated for more than four months.

At his trial, 1,000 miles away in Sverdlovsk, he told his Soviet judges: "I think my country's chief task now is to throw off the burden of a heavy past, for which it needs above all criticism and not glorification. I believe I am a better patriot than those who loudly hold forth on their love for the motherland, meaning by love for the motherland love for their privileges."

His words earned Amalrik an even stiffer sentence than the prosecutor had asked for. He was given three years in a "strict régime" labour camp. When, inevitably, his appeal failed, he began a 5,000-mile journey to eastern Siberia. The journey took four months and several times he was near death from meningitis, hunger, and beatings from vindictive guards who singled him out because he was a political prisoner.

The roll-call of protestors in Russia is long. There is Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel, authors whose works were smuggled into the West and who have only just been freed after five years in [illegible] Stalin's Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov, is now halfway through five years in exile for organising a Red Square protest over the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

At his trial Litvinov said: "At the moment of my arrest on Red Square I knew very well what was going to happen to me. The policeman said: 'You fool, if you had kept your mouth shut you could have lived peacefully.' But who is to judge what is in the interests of socialism and what is not? That is why I went to Red Square. That is what I have fought against and what I shall continue to fight against for the rest of my life."

In January Vladimir Bukovsky, 29, son of an orthodox Communist journalist, was sentenced to two years in prison followed by five in a labour camp for "anti-Soviet agitation." His crime was to protest against the practice of committing to mental hospitals those who disagree with the régime.

These people, and many others, can be said to have attacked the Kremlin head on. But Boris Zuckermann, a thoughtful 40-year-old professor of physical chemistry at Moscow University, evolved his own form of legal protest. Its origin was a letter he sent in November, 1968, to a British friend at Oxford University.

When he heard that it had failed to arrive, Zuckermann made three copies and posted them on different dates to England, all by registered post. These too became "lost," so Zuckermann complained to the Soviet Post Office.

The Claims Bureau at first ignored his complaint, but when he started to agitate for compensation, namely 22 roubles 5 kopeks (about £10), he was firmly told that the letters had gone astray in England and that the British Post Office had not replied to enquiries.

Zuckermann now began to study Soviet law. He strongly suspected that the letters had been seized by what has been called by the protest movement the "Black Office." This is the censorship bureau which has existed since Tsarist times and, ironically, was often condemned by Karl Marx.

Taking on the Post Office—with its bureaucratic nature and involvement with international postal authorities—gave him a chance to use a whole series of legalistic ploys.

When no answer came from the Claims Bureau, Zuckermann complained to the Minister of Communications, Mr. N. D. Psurtsev. The Minister again blamed the English Post Office for the loss of the letters and told Zuckermann that not until enquiries had been completed in London would he get compensation.

Study of international postal regulations convinced the Professor that this was not so. He wrote to the Public Prosecutor complaining that the Minister had taken an illegal decision. Zuckermann told us that he had acted

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

CPYRGHT

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

within Soviet law. "When people like Law to be an instrument for achieving their aims—and I take the same view."

The Public Prosecutor replied that he was referring the matter back to the Minister of Communications. Zuckermann quickly spotted that this decision, too, was illegal because under Soviet law action was the duty of the Prosecutor.

The Professor decided to take the matter to the courts himself. The District Court urged both him and the Post Office to settle out of court. He appealed against this decision to the Moscow City Court and lost. The case went to the Supreme Court, back to the City Court and eventually down to District level. Zuckermann now cunningly insisted that the Soviet Government take legal action against the British Government. A Russian Post Office official declared that his Government was not going to trouble an international organisation and the British Post Office for a mere 22 roubles.

## *Censors of the 'Black Office'*

Zuckermann's "troublemaking" had cost his Post Office more than 1,000 roubles. His plea for compensation was rejected by the court.

"Did you win or lose?" we asked him. With a slow smile he replied, "It is difficult to evaluate, but in my interpretation I won something."

The Black Office continues to censor mail, but it has been publicly humiliated by all the Professor's activity. As a result many Russians who had not been aware of its activities have learned something.

His court cases also drew upon the Professor the unwelcome attentions of the K.G.B. The first warning came from a neighbour who told his wife that if he continued the Post Office campaign they would send him to an asylum.

He was, in fact, summoned for a "psychiatric examination" by doctors dealing with Soviet Army reservists. "I was very open with them, for the doctors were friendly. Without boasting, I think they formed quite a good impression of me. The truth is they had been badly briefed by the K.G.B., which is not always perfect. I heard afterwards that when the secret police asked them why I had not been sent to an asylum they replied, 'You should have told us beforehand, because then we would have carried out other tests and asked good questions.'"

The authorities got rid of Zuckermann, a Jew, by giving him a visa for Israel. Among his friends in Russia were leaders of the Russian reform movement. One was Major-General Pyotr Grigorenko, a World [illegible] had an insane asylum for his stand on civil rights.

In recent months there have been many signs of a convergence in tactics and the planning of dissident action between Russian intellectuals and people in national groups throughout the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. is composed of 15 republics, each with its own national characteristics. The Russians themselves have always stressed their superior national position. But the nationality problem has now come to the Ukraine, and is also clearly discernible in Byelorussia, Moldavia and the Baltic States (Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia).

The Ukrainian dissidents have produced a great amount of underground literature. K.G.B. men concentrate on trying to break up the Ukrainian nationalist ferment and also to trace its links with the wider movement for general reform by searching the flats of men like Pyotr Yakir in Moscow.

What worries the central Government is that the whole reformist movement, composed of the many groups in Russia, may now be coalescing with a strongly nationalist movement against the domination of Russia in the U.S.S.R.

## *'Stalin had enough water'*

In January the K.G.B. made simultaneous swoops on the homes of "troublemakers" in Moscow, Lvov and Kiev in the Ukraine. They arrested 11 Ukrainians and charged them with "nationalist activities."

Recent issues of the *Chronicle of Current Events* and a Ukrainian underground publication, the *Ukrainian Herald*, tend to confirm Moscow fears that Ukrainian and Muscovite reformers are acting in conjunction.

In the Ukraine, as in other republics, what excites people most is the idea of preserving national culture, customs and values. But in fighting for such things they also express their dislike of Communist and Russian chauvinism and bureaucracy.

The point is proved by testimony which has just reached the West from the trial of Valentyn Moroz, a 36-year-old history teacher from the Ukraine, who has become a hero among young Ukrainians. At his secret trial he handed over a taunting letter to the judges.

"Times have changed," he wrote. "That is the whole answer. You (the authorities) find yourselves in a completely [illegible] had enough water to extinguish the fire. You have to live at a time when the reservoir is running low. . . ."

He is now serving a nine-year sentence for "anti-Soviet propaganda."

The Baltic nations are the scene of a similar upsurge, both national and religious. Recently thousands of young Lithuanians fought with military riot squads and chanted "Freedom for Lithuania" in the streets of Kaunas. Nationalist feeling grows in Lithuania. Last summer protest petitions had an average of 500 signatures. By March, this year, the nationalists had collected no less than 17,000 signatures on a document sent to Mr. Brezhnev.

Valentyn Moroz spoke prophetically at his trial about the way things are changing in the Soviet Union.

"Do not deceive yourselves," he said, "that it will always be as it is now. At a time of universal literacy, when there are 300,000 students in the Ukraine and radio sets can be had by all, at such a time every event can become known. . . . New processes are only just beginning and your repressive precautions are no longer effective. What will happen next?"

That is a question to which millions of other people would like an answer. A great deal depends on how those Soviet citizens now studying in the universities behave as they move into positions of responsibility.

Here the picture is not a very cheerful one so far as it can be pieced together from the views of rare Soviet students who come to the West and from British students who go to the Soviet Union on courses.

The teachers frequently take conventional party attitudes in their lecturing. They still discourage original thought in case it becomes politically dangerous.

As a result the students in the mass are highly conventional in thought, word and behaviour. The majority simply work mechanically to acquire their work-passport to a good job for life and try to keep out of trouble.

Nevertheless they are different from their parents. In particular they do not share any great interest or enthusiasm for the slogans and speeches of doctrinal Communism. This is not to assert that they are not loyal and patriotic Soviet citizens, they are just bored with the ideological trappings.

## *Student rebels lie low*

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0 CPYRGHT

A minority who might be described as "trendies" assert their mild rebellion by keeping out of politics and affecting imitations of Western long-hair-and-jeans styles of behaviour. They listen to group music on foreign radios, but their revolt is not a serious one. The real reformers in the universities form much smaller groups and within the universities they do not greatly advertise their views.

Young Russians at present have little influence on government. But the whole future of the reform movement depends on its growth with the universities. One of the Soviet system's most praiseworthy achievements is mass education, and it would be naive to believe that Russian youth will not eventually break out of the mould of unquestioning allegiance to the crude simplicities of peasant Communism.

Today in the Soviet Union a measure of protest exists born of disappointment with the system and bitterness against it. Soviet Jews are agitating to leave for Israel, religious groups are struggling for freedom to worship, intellectual reformers are fighting against illegalities and oppressions. National minority groups in the Ukraine and the Baltic States band together to oppose Russification of their countries.

Even today these are isolated voices of dissent in the general chorus of conformity. But the remarkable thing is not that protest is relatively limited—but that it exists at all.

Only two decades ago the State stamped out every outbreak of dissidence. And millions of citizens who had no intention of making any protest at all disappeared into murderous Arctic prison camps, many to die there.

Why, then, in an authoritarian and conformist State like the Soviet Union is protest tolerated at all now? For several reasons the Kremlin has decided that it is more opportune not to be seen to be acting too ruthlessly. It believes that the lid can be held down by selective terror rather than by the mass purges of Stalin's times.

Many reformers — Dr. Sakharov, the nuclear Academician, for example—are highly placed and important scientists. The Government knows how great is their contribution to building a Soviet Union capable of matching the technological expertise of America and the West, and it is reluctant to deprive itself of their services.

## *Memories of the old terror*

The K.G.B. could crush the reformers overnight. It chooses not to do so on the reasoned argument that it is easier to control such movements by knowing their leaders and their recruits.

Even in the conformist machine of State security itself things have changed. A new generation of intelligent and sophisticated officers is at least making a start with a gentler approach to the suppression of opposition. Hardly a family in Russia has not been touched by the horrors of the old days. K.G.B. men remember colleagues and parents purged and persecuted, and hesitate to start again a process which might eventually engulf themselves.

The leaders in the Kremlin share this reluctance to unleash outright terror. They are hemmed in by the past and threatened by the future. They have not been able to kill the new ideas. On the contrary, the protest movement has grown, its members have improved their techniques and their supporters have grown in confidence in standing up for their rights.

A new generation has emerged in the Soviet Union unscarred by the horrors of World War II and the darkness of Stalin. It is significant that among protestors brought to trial the average age is below 30. The ageing leaders in the Kremlin have still to comprehend that such people are seeking not to overthrow the Soviet system but to liberalise it and make the Soviet Union a better place to live in.

Approved For Release 1999/09/02 : CIA-RDP79-01194A000200130001-0